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Executive Summary

1.1 The draft *Statement on Key Inequalities in Employment in Northern Ireland* highlights our assessment of inequalities and differences in employment faced by equality groups across the Section 75 equality categories in Northern Ireland.

1.2 In compiling this draft Statement, the Commission has drawn on a wide range of sources including: research reports from government departments; the community and voluntary sectors; academic research and the Commission’s own research archive. In addition, the Commission undertook a detailed analysis of the Labour Force Survey by each equality ground. The Commission also contracted independent research and associated stakeholder engagement has played a key role.

1.3 Alongside a number of differences and wider inequalities, twelve key inequalities have been identified for participation in employment and the sustainability of employment, from data spanning 2007-2016.

1.4 These are presented below along with short explanations. An important caveat is that there remain significant and specific data gaps across a number of themes in relation to a number of equality groups, specifically: gender identity and sexual orientation. In addition, there is a lack of data disaggregation in relation to ethnicity; and, dependency status. These shortfalls limit the Commission’s ability to draw robust conclusions about inequalities, and/or progress in addressing the same across the full range of equality categories and groups.

1.5 This draft Statement is presented to enable the Commission to engage with stakeholders; to test and refine findings in order to inform a final Statement. We welcome your comments and views. Please forward your comments and views to research@equalityni.org by 12 noon on 5 January 2018.
Women, lone parents with dependents and carers who provide less than 49 hours of care are more likely to be in part-time employment.

Women experience industrial segregation in employment.

Women and lone parents experience occupational segregation in employment.

Migrant workers, particularly those from Eastern countries are subject to industrial and occupational segregation.

Migrant workers are vulnerable to exploitation.

Prejudicial attitudes both within and outside the workplace are experienced by people with disabilities, Trans people, lesbian, gay and bisexual people, people from minority ethnic groups, migrant workers and those of different religious beliefs.

There is a persistent employment gap between people with and without disabilities.

Women experience a lower employment rate and a higher economic inactivity rate when they have dependents.

Lone parents with dependents experience barriers to their participation in employment.

Carers experience barriers to participating in employment.

Irish Travellers are less likely to be in employment than all other ethnic groups.

Those aged 18-24 years old have higher unemployment rates than those aged 25 years and older.
1.6 People with a disability are more likely to be not working and not actively looking for work (economically inactive) than people without disabilities; consequently, they are much less likely to be in employment than people without disabilities. In addition, the gap in the employment rate between people with and without disabilities is persistent, having shown little change between 2006 and 2016.

1.7 For people with disabilities, gaps in educational attainment may partially account for the large employment gap between people with and without disabilities. However, even when attainment is accounted for participation in employment is still lower for people with disabilities than non-disabled people with equivalent qualifications.

1.8 People with disabilities, however, face wider barriers such as access to transport, the physical environment and limited support in employment, all of which can impact on their ability to participate in employment.

1.9 Among people with disabilities, people with mental health issues and/or a learning disability are less likely to be employed compared to people with hidden disabilities, progressive or other disabilities, physical disabilities and/or sensory disabilities.

1.10 Women experience a lower employment rate and a higher economic inactivity rate when they have dependents.

1.11 Factors explaining this are likely to be linked to the disproportionate share of caregiving by women, with gender stereotypes relating to the role of the mother as primary caregiver and father as the earner that may result in higher rates of economic inactivity among women.
The cost and availability of childcare is another factor influencing female participation in the work place, with Northern Ireland having one of the lowest levels of available childcare and being one of the most expensive regions for childcare in the UK. For women, paid work may not be considered worthwhile if a significant proportion of female-generated income is being spent on childcare.

In addition, qualifications and confidence are an issue for women from disadvantaged backgrounds; low-skilled and low-paid jobs often do not allow them to afford paid childcare and may offer lower levels of flexibility to accommodate caregiving. In addition, the current social welfare system may inhibit labour market participation, as women are unsure if work-based income would exceed benefits-based income, particularly when the cost of childcare and risk of losing housing benefits is taken into account.

Lone parents with dependents experience barriers to their participation in employment

Lone parents with dependents experience a lower employment rate and a higher economic inactivity rate, particularly for females who constitute the majority of lone parents. Factors explaining this are similar to that experienced by women with dependents but further compounded for lone parents with dependents who have sole responsibility for the care of their child.

Carers experience barriers to participating in employment.

Barriers for carers increase with the volume of care provided. Carers who provide more than 20 hours of care per week are less likely to be in employment and more likely to be economically inactive than those who do not provide care.

For carers, a lack of flexibility in the workplace to enable them to manage caring responsibilities and a lack of suitable care services are major barriers to participation. However, attitudinal barriers to carers from employers and work colleagues also represent a barrier to employment.
1.17 These factors result in some carers giving up work, the consequence of which are negative impacts on their finances, health and wellbeing.

**Key Inequality**

Irish Travellers are less likely to be in employment than all other ethnic groups.

1.18 Irish Travellers are less likely to be in employment and more likely to be economically inactive than all other ethnic groups. Female Travellers, in particular, are less likely to participate in employment and are more likely to be economically inactive than females from all other ethnic groups.

1.19 Low educational attainment may partially account for the large employment gap between Irish Travellers and other ethnic groups. Another major barrier is prejudice and discrimination both in society and in the workplace with discriminatory attitudes preventing them from participating in employment. In addition, a greater traditional emphasis on family and home, as well as cultural resistance to the use of formal childcare are all major barriers to the participation of Irish Travellers in employment.

**Key Inequality**

Those aged 18-24 years old have higher unemployment rates than those aged 25 years and older.

1.20 Those aged 18-24 years old have higher unemployment rates than those aged 25 years and older. Youth employment was identified as a key inequality in our previous 2007 Statement on Key Inequalities. Youth unemployment is associated with lifelong problems, such as worklessness, poverty, limited employment opportunities, low wages, lower average life satisfaction and ill health.
1.21 Women are more likely to be in part-time employment than men. Lone parents with dependent children are more likely to be in employment on a part-time basis. In addition, carers who provide less than 49 hours of unpaid care are more likely to work part-time.

1.22 While part-time working is one of a number of means by which women, lone parents, and carers balance employment with caring responsibilities, it can negatively influence progression in employment, with women, lone parents and carers sometimes perceived negatively for asking for flexible working. Women, lone parents and carers working part-time are also at risk of low pay and precarious employment, as many part-time jobs are typically associated with the minimum wage and atypical contracts.

1.23 Women are under-represented in industries associated with Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) such as Manufacturing, Transport and Communication, Energy and Water and Construction.

1.24 Stereotyping and bias within our culture and particularly within male-dominated engineering and technology sectors, has been cited as one factor in the under-representation of women within these industries.

1.25 In addition, young women are less likely to choose to study STEM subjects at further and higher education compared to young men thus decreasing their availability for high-level STEM jobs, where men outnumber women by nearly three to one.
1.26 Women are under-represented in the highest paid and highest status occupations such as ‘Managers and Senior Officials’ and are over-represented in occupations that are more likely to be lower status and lower paid, such as ‘Administrative and Secretarial’, ‘Personal Service’ and ‘Sales and Customer Service’. Moreover, women are more likely to report underemployment in their chosen occupation compared to men.

1.27 Lone parents also experience occupational segregation in employment, with lone parents with dependent children mostly employed in ‘Personal Service’ and ‘Elementary’ occupations.

1.28 Caregiving has been identified as one factor influencing occupational segregation with women and lone parents choosing occupations allowing sufficient flexibility to balance the demands of caregiving. This may have a potential impact on the sustainability of employment, with women and lone parents having to consider pay and career progression with flexibility in employment.

1.29 Migrant workers, particularly Eastern Europeans are over-represented in low-paid, low status jobs such as ‘Process, Plant and Machine Operatives’ and ‘Elementary’ occupations and in low paid-industry sectors such as the ‘Manufacturing’ industry sector and the ‘Distribution, Hotels and Restaurants’ industry sector.

1.30 While migrant workers tended to be working in higher-level occupations in their home country, it has been posited that gaining a lower level job in Northern Ireland is treated as a step toward gaining higher-level employment in the future.
1.31 Many migrant workers who are agency workers are confined to temporary and irregular work, including zero hour contracts. Many face poorer terms and conditions than local workers and are vulnerable to poor employment practices, including a lack of written contracts, long-working hours, non-payment of wages and problems accessing statutory entitlements such as leave.

1.32 In addition, human trafficking is an issue in Northern Ireland, with evidence of practices that constitute forced labour of migrant workers. Common means of forcing people to work include withholding personal documents and forcing migrant workers to pay off debt incurred from ‘borrowing’ money to secure employment. In addition, migrant workers in tied accommodation are also vulnerable to exploitation.

1.33 Factors associated with exploitation include an individual’s legal status, a lack of language skills, limited access to social networks and a lack of local knowledge.

Prejudicial attitudes both within and outside the workplace are experienced by people with disabilities, Trans people, lesbian, gay and bisexual people, people from minority ethnic groups, migrant workers and those of different religious beliefs.

1.34 People with disabilities are more likely to experience prejudice in employment than those without disabilities. Among people with disabilities, people with mental health issues are most likely to be viewed negatively as a work colleague or boss. This stigma and prejudice may impact on the ability of people with disabilities to sustain employment, with disability-related discrimination complaints representing the highest number of enquiries, with respect to employment, to the Equality Commission’s Discrimination Advice Team.
1.35 Trans people face prejudice and hostility in the workplace. Ignorance of Trans issues from employers and work colleagues a key issue in sustaining employment.

1.36 Lesbian, gay and bisexual employees are subject to prejudicial attitudes in the workplace. Lesbian, gay and bisexual people often face negative comments and bullying at work due to their sexuality, and may be reluctant to come out in the workplace due to fears of victimisation. Prejudicial attitudes may impact on the ability of lesbian, gay and bisexual people to participate in employment, sustain employment and progress in employment.

1.37 People from minority ethnic groups and migrant workers are subject to prejudice and discrimination both within and outside the workplace. Prejudicial attitudes have been expressed toward Irish Travellers, migrant workers and minority ethnic groups. Racial prejudice and discrimination can impact on the ability of minority ethnic groups and migrant workers to participate in employment, sustain employment and progress in employment. Racial prejudice has been identified in accessing employment and in experiences of racial harassment and intimidation in workplaces.

1.38 Prejudicial attitudes and/or discrimination on the grounds of religious belief is present both within and outside the workplace. Prejudicial attitudes toward those of different religious beliefs is present in Northern Ireland, particularly sectarianism and islamophobia. Prejudicial attitudes, harassment and, intimidation can create a climate of fear which can impact on a person’s ability to sustain employment, particularly where individuals are reluctant to speak out due to fears of further victimisation.
2 Introduction

2.1 The draft Statement on Key Inequalities in Employment in Northern Ireland highlights the nature and extent of inequalities across the nine equality grounds covered by Section 75 of the Northern Ireland Act 1998: gender; racial group; disability status; sexual orientation; religious belief; political opinion; age; marital status; and dependency status. Where possible, inequalities experienced by members of a particular equality group due to multiple identities are also highlighted.

2.2 The Draft Statement updates the employment component of the Commission’s previous Statement on Key Inequalities in Northern Ireland published in 2007. It will form part of a larger series of Statements on Key Inequalities that highlight key inequalities in areas such as housing; health and social care; participation in public life; education; and, social attitudes.

Focus

2.3 Participation in the labour market and the sustainability of employment will be experienced differently by individuals and this can depend upon a person’s characteristics or identities in equality terms. Accordingly, this report highlights inequalities and differences in employment outcomes across the equality grounds, for the period 2007 to 2016. Where barriers to equality of opportunity have been identified they are also considered and reported. It is hoped that a consideration, in tandem, of key outcome inequalities and/or differences and associated barriers, may help inform the further development of public policies and associated interventions. Where possible, the identification of inequalities is supported by a range of information sources (including literature and data), and is informed by stakeholder engagement.

2.4 The Commission, in this Draft Statement, does not seek to consider or evaluate the effectiveness of Government

---

1 Equality grounds are those specified above, equality groups are the categories within those grounds e.g. gender is an equality ground, males and females are the groups within that ground.
2 ECNI (2007) Statement on Key Inequalities in Northern Ireland. ECNI: Belfast
strategies, policies or practices. Rather, the Commission seeks to draw attention to persistent and/or emergent inequalities so that actions can be developed, improved or re-affirmed to advance equality.

2.5 The *draft Statement* reports key differences and inequalities in the equality outcomes, and where possible the barriers, faced by equality groups in Northern Ireland.

2.6 It is intended that the consideration of differences, inequalities and barriers contained within this *Draft Statement*, will be utilised to inform the ongoing development of policy positions and associated interventions across not only the relevant Departments, agencies and functions of government, but by all those organisations who have responsibilities for, or an interest in, employment in Northern Ireland.

**Approach and Methodology**

2.7 In compiling this *draft Statement*, the Commission has drawn, on a wide range of sources including research reports from Government departments; the community and voluntary sectors; academic research and the Commission’s own research archive. In addition, the Commission undertook a detailed analysis of the Labour Force Survey by each equality ground, from quarter one (Q1) 2012 to Q1 2016.

2.8 The Commission also contracted independent research from The Employment Research Institute, Edinburgh Napier University. The resultant research report *‘Employment Inequalities in Northern Ireland’ – Raeside et al. (2014)*\(^3\) and associated stakeholder engagement has played a key role in informing this statement.

2.9 Raeside *et al.* (2014)\(^4\) analysed data from the Northern Ireland Labour Force Survey (LFS), the Northern Ireland Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings (ASHE) and the Northern Ireland Statistics and Research Agency (NISRA) over the period

---


2006/2007-2012, as well as the results of the Census 2011\(^5\), \(^6\). Raeside et al.’s research report also drew on attitudinal data from the *Northern Ireland Life and Times Survey* (NILTS)\(^7\), as well as from the Commission’s *Equality Awareness Survey 2011*\(^8\). The research also incorporated primary qualitative research in the form of focus groups, interviews and an expert seminar with key stakeholders.

2.10 Key Inequalities, inequalities and differences were identified from this analysis, using specific criteria. An *inequality* was identified where a difference in the labour market was found and this could be associated with identified barriers to employment for this equality grouping.

2.11 In deciding whether an inequality was ‘key’, identified inequalities were considered in relation to the following criteria:

- **Relevance**: The inequality is clearly aligned to the Commission’s statutory remit.
- **Persistence**: The problem is persistent or getting worse. Neither legislation nor other public policy intervention has influenced it substantially.
- **Scale and/or Severity**: The issue effects many people or impacts severely on a smaller group.
- **Societal Benefit**: It is in the public interest to reduce the inequality.
- **Opportunity for Intervention**: The issue is currently amenable to solution and measurement. There is a strong argument for progressing action now, including alignment to current policy priorities.

2.12 Identified Key Inequalities and Inequalities were considered under two broad headings:

- **Participation** in employment – meaning there are opportunities to participate in employment, including economic inactivity and activity, and whether in full-time or

\(^5\) *Census 2011* for Northern Ireland, NISRA 2012A; 2013A; 2013B; 2013C

\(^6\) For definitions of terms used within this Draft Statement see Annex 1.

\(^7\) 2006, 2010 and 2012

part-time employment; and there are few or no cultural or other barriers to participating in employment

- **Sustainability** of employment – meaning the employment is sustainable with regard to monetary rewards, the employment is not temporary or precarious in relation to contracted hours; the employment offers opportunity for training and personal development; the employment offers career progression and there are few or no cultural or other barriers to continuing or progressing in employment.

2.13 In addition, the report outlines areas where there are **key data gaps** that make inequalities and differences difficult or impossible to assess in a robust manner.

### Challenges

2.14 The Commission is mindful that there are complex relationships between employment and other domains, such as labour markets, social security, health, immigration and public attitudes. Action to address inequalities will demand a co-ordinated approach, across not only a range of Departments, agencies and functions of government, but also by organisations who have responsibilities for or an interest in, employment in Northern Ireland, to develop long-term multi-faceted policy interventions.

2.15 The *draft Statement* highlights the fact that many inequalities remain persistent and hard to tackle. In addition, there are new and emerging inequalities that are impacting on individuals across the equality grounds.

2.16 Further, whilst socio-economic disadvantage is not a specified ground under the equality legislation, the barriers and inequalities experienced by equality groups can be exacerbated by poverty and social exclusion. The Commission continues to highlight the link between poverty and social exclusion, and the inequalities faced by individuals protected under the equality legislation.
3 Overall Context of Employment in Northern Ireland

The Northern Ireland Economy

3.1 The Northern Ireland economy is characterised by a number of factors that influence the employment opportunities available to the population. Research has highlighted the relative economic disadvantage of Northern Ireland with respect to other regions of the UK; with Northern Ireland associated with a weak economy, low productivity, low wages, low employment rates, a geography on the periphery of Europe and a lack of inward investment.

3.2 Northern Ireland also faces economic challenges associated with sectoral composition, being characterised by a large public sector, a large proportion of small to medium-sized enterprises (SME) and fewer large firms or higher value-added sectors such as finance and business services.

3.3 While Northern Ireland has its economic challenges, it also has its relative economic strengths including a relatively young population, competitive labour costs, excellent broadband coverage and a relatively low crime rate.

3.4 In the coming years, the Northern Ireland economy will embrace the challenges and opportunities posed by the UK’s

---

exit from the European Union (‘Brexit’), the impact of which is unclear.

**Income**

3.5 The New Policy Institute (2016) reports that both Northern Ireland and Great Britain experienced a period of decreases in pay or pay freezes during the last decade\(^1\). However, whilst falls in pay have ceased ‘pay levels remain well behind where they were a decade ago once inflation is taken into account’\(^2\).

3.6 Between 2006 and 2015 the pay gap between Northern Ireland and Great Britain was consistent; with Northern Ireland having a lower rate in the region of £50 median weekly pay which dropped to £45 median weekly pay in 2015\(^3\)\(^4\).

3.7 With regard to those, whose earnings are in the bottom quarter of the income distribution, the difference between Northern Ireland and Great Britain increased between 2009 and 2014\(^5\). Whereas the difference in average weekly pay was only £13 in 2009, this increased to £33 in 2014\(^6\).

**Households Below Average Income**

3.8 The Households Below Average Income (HBAI) measure provides a proxy for material living standards\(^7\). A HBAI analysis takes into account both Before Housing Costs (BHC) and After Housing Costs (AHC) incomes at the level of the individual, although only the AHC income allows comparability between Northern Ireland and the United Kingdom as a whole\(^8\)\(^9\).

\(^{16}\) In 2015, the median weekly pay for NI was £382 compared to £427 for GB.
\(^{21}\) This is due to how water rates are considered.
3.9 The AHC data estimates that the United Kingdom and Northern Ireland experienced similar rates of decrease in median income per week between 2006/07 and 2014/15 at 2.0 and 1.8 percentage points, respectively\(^{23}\). However, at all time points the median household income per week for Northern Ireland was lower than that for the United Kingdom; the smallest gap between the two was evidenced in 2008/09 at £7 per week and the largest in 2011/12 at £28 per week. In 2013/14 the gap stood at £24 per week\(^{24}\).

**Income Poverty**

3.10 The New Policy Institute (2016) reports that, after housing costs around 20% of people in Northern Ireland were in poverty ‘in the two years to 2013/14’, a rate that matched that in Great Britain\(^{25}\).

3.11 Furthermore, the Northern Ireland Statistics and Research Agency’s (2015) analysis of Family Resources Survey data found that the rate of absolute income poverty in both 2011/12 and 2013/14\(^{26}\), was the highest recorded since the survey began in 2002/03; with the rate eight percentage points higher than that recorded in 2006/07\(^{27}\).

**Rates of Employment, Unemployment and Inactivity**

3.12 The United Kingdom entered a period of recession in the third quarter of 2008, exiting it in the last quarter of 2009\(^{28}\). Great Britain has since experienced ‘strong employment growth’. In contrast, growth in Northern Ireland has not been as strong: for example, the New Policy Institute reports that ‘in the four years to 2015, the working-age employment rate in GB has increased

---


\(^{26}\) After housing costs were considered.

\(^{27}\) This research was commissioned by the DSD. DSD (2015) *Households Below Average Income: An analysis of the income distribution in Northern Ireland 2013-14*.
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by 3.0 percentage points to 73 per cent, whereas in Northern Ireland it has risen by 0.6 percentage points to 68 per cent\(^{29}\).

3.13 Despite the recession, the Northern Ireland Labour Market Report reported that, between 2006 and 2016, Northern Ireland’s employment rate remained relatively stable\(^{30}, 31\).

3.14 However, whilst the employment rate remained stable, at each time point between 2006 and 2016, the employment rate for Northern Ireland was lower than that of the UK as a whole\(^{32}\). The widest gap between the two was in the period February to April, 2009\(^{33}\) and the narrowest in the period November to January, 2012\(^{34}, 35, 36\).

3.15 In contrast to a relatively steady employment rate, rates of unemployment have fluctuated between 2006 and 2016 with the highest rate of unemployment between November and January 2013\(^{37}\). However, since 2013, unemployment rates have declined to levels similar to those experienced in 2006\(^{38}, 39\).

3.16 Whilst UK unemployment rates were usually higher than those of Northern Ireland between 2006 and 2013, this pattern

---

30 The Northern Ireland Labour Market Report utilises LFS data. The LFS considers employment to be someone who is: an employee; self-employed; taking part in a government scheme; and, an unpaid family worker.
33 The rate of employment in Northern Ireland was 64.6% compared to 71.4% for the United Kingdom as a whole; resulting in a gap of 6.8 percentage points.
34 The rate of employment in Northern Ireland was 68.0% compared to 70.3% for the United Kingdom as a whole; resulting in a gap of 2.3 percentage points.
35 The Northern Ireland labour Market Report reports on the following periods: May-July; August-October; November-January; and, February-April.
37 The unemployment rate in May-July of 2007 was 3.2% compared to 8.3% in November-January of 2013.
38 Rates of unemployment in May-July of 2006 were 4.4% compared to 5.6% in May-July of 2016; as reported in the Northern Ireland Labour Market Report.
reversed in August-October of 2013 with Northern Ireland experiencing higher rates of unemployment than the UK\textsuperscript{40, 41}.

3.17 Northern Ireland retained a higher rate of claimants of unemployment-related benefits than the UK as a whole each month between August 2006 and August 2016\textsuperscript{42}. The gap increased from June 2006\textsuperscript{43} to reach its peak in each month of 2014\textsuperscript{44}, before the gap narrowed to a level of 1.7 percentage points in August 2016\textsuperscript{45}.

3.18 Economic inactivity remained relatively stable over the period 2006 to 2016, with the highest rates recorded in 2009\textsuperscript{46}. A reduction in economic inactivity of 2.0 percentage points was evidenced between May - July 2006 and May - July 2016\textsuperscript{47}. The rate of economic inactivity in the UK as a whole was consistently lower than that of Northern Ireland; the largest gap between the two was 8.1 percentage points in February-April 2009 and the smallest gap was in May-July and August–October 2011\textsuperscript{48}.

**Employment at the Level of the Household**

3.19 Statistics on working and workless households provided by the Office for National Statistics' (2015) show that, between 2006 and 2014, at a household level, Northern Ireland and Great Britain followed the same pattern of employment: most households were either working or mixed households; and,

---

\textsuperscript{40} In May-July 2006 the UK had an unemployment rate that was 1.1 percentage points higher than Northern Ireland; in May-July 2016 Northern Ireland's unemployment rate was 0.7 percentage points lower than that in the UK.

\textsuperscript{41} NISRA (2016) *Northern Ireland Labour Market Report September 2016*.

\textsuperscript{42} The claimant rate for Northern Ireland was 3.9% in August 2016 compared to 2.2% for the UK as a whole.

\textsuperscript{43} The claimant rate for Northern Ireland was 3.2% in August 2006 compared to 2.9% for the UK as a whole. In June 2009 the rate for Northern Ireland was 5.6% compared to 4.7% for the UK as a whole.

\textsuperscript{44} In 2014 the gap in claimant rates between Northern Ireland and the UK as a whole differed by 3.0-3.1 percentage points each month.

\textsuperscript{45} NISRA (2016) *Northern Ireland Labour Market Report September 2016*.

\textsuperscript{46} Economic inactivity rates in 2009 ranged from 30.0% to 31.3%.

\textsuperscript{47} The economic inactivity rate for Northern Ireland was 28.4% in May-July 2006 compared to 26.4% in May-July 2016.

\textsuperscript{48} The gap between Northern Ireland and the UK as a whole for economic inactivity was 3.8 percentage points in both May-July and August-October 2011, respectively.
workless households made up the smallest proportion of households\textsuperscript{49, 50}.

3.20 However, for each year between 2006 and 2014 the proportion of working households in Great Britain\textsuperscript{51} was consistently higher than that in Northern Ireland\textsuperscript{52, 53}. Northern Ireland therefore retained a higher proportion of mixed and workless households compared to Great Britain between 2006 and 2014; with the greater differences in rates evidenced in workless households\textsuperscript{54}.

3.21 The rate of workless households in Northern Ireland remained fairly stable each year between 2006 and 2014, at around a fifth of households. Mixed households made up a little under a third of households; and working households under a half\textsuperscript{55}.

**Demographics**

3.22 Annex 1 to this *Draft Statement on Key Inequalities in Employment in Northern Ireland* provides definitions of the terms used by the International Labour Organisation (ILO). In addition, the annex also includes details on the population demographics of those in employment in Northern Ireland.

---

\textsuperscript{49} Households included in the analysis were those that included at least one person aged 16 to 64 years old. Mixed households can contain both working and workless members.


\textsuperscript{51} Rates were in the range of 52.6\% to 56.2\%.

\textsuperscript{52} Rates were in the range of 44.4\% to 48.8\%.


4 Disability Status

4.1 The Labour Force Survey (LFS) asks respondents to self-identify any disabilities they may have. Respondents’ disabilities are recorded using seventeen categories. However, it is not possible to draw conclusions about the employment situation for each individual category since numbers in the LFS mean that any such analysis would be meaningless. Therefore, both Raeside et al. (2014) and the Commission’s analysis of LFS data collapses categories into more manageable groups to facilitate analysis.\(^{56}\)

4.2 For the purposes of a broad analysis the groupings of disabled and not-disabled were utilised; this analysis was then gendered where possible to ascertain if there were any differences or inequalities due to disability and gender. Lastly, an analysis was undertaken using the following groups, where possible: physical and/or sensory disability; mental health and/or learning disability; hidden disability; and, a progressive or other disability.\(^{57}\)

Summary

4.3 There are inequalities for disabled people in relation to participation in employment. There is a persistent employment gap between people with and without disabilities. People with a disability are more likely to be not working and not actively looking for work (economically inactive) than people without disabilities; consequently, they are much less likely to be in employment than people without disabilities.

4.4 When considering the employment gap, the gap in educational attainment needs to considered and addressed; people with disabilities are more likely to have no or fewer qualifications.

---


\(^{57}\) Where possible refers to where numbers in the LFS meet the minimum threshold of 8,000 individuals advised by NISRA.
compared to people without disabilities, which may impact on their ability to gain employment in the first instance.

4.5 However, even when level of attainment is accounted for, disabled people are less likely to be working than non-disabled people with equivalent qualifications. People with disabilities, however, face wider barriers such as access to transport, the physical environment and limited support in employment, all of which can impact on their ability to participate in employment.

4.6 Among people with disabilities, people with mental health issues and/or a learning disability are less likely to be employed than people with hidden disabilities, progressive or other disabilities or physical and/or sensory disabilities.

4.7 **People with disabilities are more likely to experience prejudice in employment than those without disabilities.** Among people with disabilities, people with mental health issues are most likely to be viewed negatively as a work colleague or boss. This stigma and prejudice may impact on the sustainability of employment for people with disabilities. Disability-related discrimination complaints represent the highest number of enquiries, with respect to employment, to the Equality Commission’s Discrimination Advice Team.

**Key Inequalities**

**Key Inequality**

There is a persistent employment gap between people with and without disabilities

4.8 Raeside et al.'s (2014) analysis of 2006 to 2012 Labour Force Survey (LFS) data showed that, between 2006 and 2012, those without a disability consistently had higher rates of employment than those with a disability58. 59.

---

58 Raeside reported the rate of employment for those without a disability to be 77.1% in Q1 2006 and 76.5% in Q1 2012. Compared to this the rate reported for those with a disability was 36.0% in Q1 2006 and 38.5% in Q1 2012.

The Commission, through its analysis of LFS data, found that this was also evident between 2012 and 2016. At each time point between 2012 and 2016, more than three quarters of those without a disability were in employment\(^{60}\). In comparison, those with a disability were much less likely to be employed and retained employment rates of between 30-40% between 2012 and 2016\(^{61}\). This is a persistent inequality, given that similar findings where highlighted in our 2007 Statement on Key Inequalities in Northern Ireland, which noted that ‘the employment rate for those without disabilities is over twice that of people with disabilities’\(^{62}\).

The 2011 Census showed that, at the time of the census, nearly a fifth of those aged 16 to 74 years old stated that they had a limiting long-term illness\(^{63},^{64}\). The Census 2011 also found low employment rates for those who had a limiting long-term illness; in 2011 just over a fifth stated that they were employed at the time of the census\(^{65}\); accounting for only 6.1% of those in employment in Northern Ireland at the time of the census\(^{66}\). In comparison, 71.1% of those with no limiting long-term illness were in employment at the time of the census; accounting for the remaining 93.9% of those in employment\(^{67}\).

The Commission split LFS data into four disability groups: physical and/or sensory disability; mental health and/or learning disability; hidden disability; and, a progressive or other disability. It found that, in each year between 2012 and 2016 over half of those with hidden disabilities were in employment\(^{68}\), slightly lower rates of employment were found for those with progressive or other disabilities\(^{69}\) and those with physical

\(^{60}\) For example, 75.5% of those without a disability were employed in Q1 2012 and 78.5% in Q1 2016.
\(^{61}\) For example, 35.2% of those with a disability were employed in Q1 2012 and 35.1% in Q1 2016.
\(^{63}\) 17.1% of those aged 16-64 years old reported that they had a limiting long-term illness.
\(^{64}\) Census Table T58: *Theme table on economic activity*. This census table considers those aged 16 years old to pensionable age.
\(^{65}\) 22.3% of those with a limiting long-term illness were employed at the time of the Census 2011.
\(^{66}\) Census Table T58: *Theme table on economic activity*. This census table considers those aged 16 years old to pensionable age.
\(^{67}\) Census Table T58: *Theme table on economic activity*. This census table considers those aged 16 years old to pensionable age.
\(^{68}\) In Q1 2012 56.6% of those with hidden disabilities were in employment, compared to: 57.7% in Q1 2013; 58.2% in Q1 2014; 59.0% in Q1 2015; and, 55.1% in Q1 2016.
\(^{69}\) In Q1 2012 53.0% of those with progressive or other disabilities were in employment, compared to: 50.6% in Q1 2013; 52.3% in Q1 2014; 47.8% in Q1 2015; and, 45.7% in Q1 2016.
and/or sensory disabilities\textsuperscript{70}. The lowest rates of employment were found to be for those with a mental health and/or learning disability\textsuperscript{71}.

4.12 When considering the employment gap, the gap in educational attainment needs to be considered. Almost three times the proportion of people with disabilities have no qualifications compared to non-disabled persons. Overall, persons with a disability are less qualified than those without. In particular, only 11\% of those with a disability held a degree or equivalent, compared with 25\% of people without a disability; 35\% of those with a disability have no qualifications compared to 12\% without\textsuperscript{72}.

4.13 However, research\textsuperscript{73} has identified that even when the qualifications of people with and without disabilities is taken into account, people with disabilities were found to be more likely to be lacking but wanting work, and when working are more likely to be low paid than those without disabilities.

4.14 People with disabilities face additional barriers that may impact on their ability to participate in employment, such as access to transport and the accessibility of the physical environment. For example, Disability Action and The Detail found major shortfalls in disability access in relation to tourist, cultural and sporting venues\textsuperscript{74}. Moreover, accessibility audits of seven towns across Northern Ireland by the Inclusive Mobility Transport Committee (IMTAC) have highlighted the persistence of a number of unnecessary physical barriers\textsuperscript{75}. In addition, the Disabled People’s Voices NI report noted that while improvements have been made to public transport there is some way to go before disabled people can travel routinely by bus or train\textsuperscript{76}.

\textsuperscript{70} In Q1 2012 41.8\% of those with physical and/or sensory disabilities were in employment, compared to: 49.7\% in Q1 2013; 48.6\% in Q1 2014; 42.1\% in Q1 2015; and, 40.4\% in Q1 2016.
\textsuperscript{71} In Q1 2012 26.4\% of those with mental health and/or learning disabilities were in employment, compared to: 22.4\% in Q1 2013; 24.9\% in Q1 2014; 22.9\% in Q1 2015; and, 32.6\% in Q1 2016.
\textsuperscript{73} MacInnes T, Tinson A, Gaffney D, Horgan G and Baumberg B (2014). Disability, long-term conditions and poverty, p33. New Policy Institute.
Moreover, limited access to support in employment\textsuperscript{77} can also act as a barrier to employment for those with disabilities. One major barrier identified to Supported Employment was the 16 hours per week minimum that both discrete and mainstream government programs required. However, it is disabled people who are unable to work 16 hours per week, that often require the most support in employment. The new phase of the government support program Workable (NI) has reduced this requirement to ten hours\textsuperscript{78}.

\begin{quote}
\textbf{Inequality}

People with a disability are more likely to be economically inactive than those without a disability.
\end{quote}

The lower employment rate of those with a disability is supported by the identification of a higher rate of economic inactivity for disabled people.

Both Raeside \textit{et al.} (2014) and the Commission, found that between 2006 and 2016, those with a disability consistently had higher rates of economic inactivity than those without a disability\textsuperscript{79}.

The Commission's analysis of LFS data over the period 2012 to 2016 showed that the economic inactivity rates for those with a disability remained stable in 2016 when compared to 2012\textsuperscript{80}. Over the time period some fluctuation in rates was apparent evidenced in a range of 54.0\% to 61.4\%\textsuperscript{81}.

This was also evidenced in the Census 2011, which found that nearly three quarters (73.6\%) of those with a limiting long-term illness were economically inactive at the time of the census, 

\textsuperscript{77} DSD (2013): 'Work and the welfare system in Northern Ireland' DSD: Belfast.
\textsuperscript{78} Supported Employment Solutions (2016): \textit{Official launch of Workable (NI)}.
\textsuperscript{80} The economic inactivity rate for those with a disability was 60.2\% in Q1 2012 and 60.0\% in Q1 2016.
\textsuperscript{81} The economic inactivity rate for those with a disability was 54.0\% in Q4 2012 and 61.4\% in Q2 2015.
compared to a fifth (20.7%) of those who did not have a limiting long-term illness.

4.20 The Commission’s analysis of LFS data by four disability groupings showed that those with a mental health and/or learning disability retained the highest rates of economic inactivity of all disability groupings in each year between 2012 and 2016\textsuperscript{82}. Those with physical and/or sensory disabilities\textsuperscript{83} and those with hidden progressive or other disabilities\textsuperscript{84} maintained similar rates of economic inactivity to one another, whilst those with hidden disabilities retained the lowest rates of economic inactivity\textsuperscript{85}.

4.21 For the majority (68.7%) of those with a limiting long-term illness, the reason for being economically inactive at the time of the Census 2011 were due to being permanently sick/disabled. Around a tenth of those with a limiting long-term illness were economically inactive due to an ‘other’ reason (12.2%) or looking after the family/home (10.6%).

4.22 In contrast, the main reasons for those who did not have a limiting long-term illness were: looking after the family/home (39.3%); being a student (36.2%); and, due to an ‘other’ reason (16.0%)\textsuperscript{86}.

4.23 The Commission’s analysis of LFS data found similar reasons for those with a disability not being in employment. Data showed that, in both 2012 and 2016, the top three reasons that those with a disability did not seek work in the previous four

---

\textsuperscript{82} In Q1 2012 68.5% of those with a mental health or learning disability were economically inactive, compared to: 67.2% in Q1 2013; 65.7% in Q1 2014; 66.6% in Q1 2015; and, 62.2% in Q1 2016.

\textsuperscript{83} In Q1 2012 54.2% of those with physical and/or sensory disabilities were economically inactive, compared to: 44.7% in Q1 2013; 44.3% in Q1 2014; 52.2% in Q1 2015; and, 54.7% in Q1 2016.

\textsuperscript{84} In Q1 2012 43.4% of those with progressive or other disabilities were economically inactive, compared to: 44.8% in Q1 2013; 44.5% in Q1 2014; 49.2% in Q1 2015; and, 51.9% in Q1 2016.

\textsuperscript{85} In Q1 2012 37.1% of those with hidden disabilities were economically inactive, compared to: 36.9% in Q1 2013; 38.1% in Q1 2014; 35.3% in Q1 2015; and, 37.4% in Q1 2016.

\textsuperscript{86} Census Table T58: Theme table on economic activity. This census table considers those aged 16 years old to pensionable age.
weeks were due to: being long-term sick or disabled\textsuperscript{87}; looking after the family/home\textsuperscript{88}; and, being retired\textsuperscript{89}.

\begin{boxedtext}
People with disabilities are more likely to experience prejudice in employment than those without disabilities.
\end{boxedtext}

4.24 Raeside \textit{et al.} (2014) reported that ‘many of the barriers to employment for disabled workers appear to come from the stigma and discrimination they experience in trying to obtain work’\textsuperscript{90}. There is evidence of prejudicial attitudes toward disabled people in Northern Ireland. It has been found that there is ‘prejudice against disabled people as a potential work colleague’, a finding, which was ‘most notable with regard to people with mental ill health’\textsuperscript{91}.

4.25 This conclusion was based upon the findings of the Commission’s 2008\textsuperscript{92} and 2011\textsuperscript{93} Equality Awareness Surveys (EQAS), which asked respondents if they would mind ‘a little’ or ‘a lot’ having someone with a disability as a work colleague. The surveys showed that attitudes in Northern Ireland toward those with a disability had hardened somewhat compared to 2008, with higher proportions of respondents in 2011 indicating that they would mind ‘a little’ or ‘a lot’ having someone with mental ill-health, learning or physical disability as a work colleague\textsuperscript{94, 95}.

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{87} In Q1 2012 61.9\% of those who had a disability did not seek work in the four weeks prior to the LFS data collection due to being long-term sick or disabled, this remained fairly stable at 62.2\% in Q1 2016.
\item \textsuperscript{88} In Q1 2012 12.2\% of those who had a disability did not seek work in the four weeks prior to the LFS data collection due to looking after the family/home, this increased to 15.1\% in Q1 2016.
\item \textsuperscript{89} In Q1 2012 11.1\% of those who had a disability did not seek work in the four weeks prior to the LFS data collection due to being retired, this decreased to 8.7\% in Q1 2016.
\item \textsuperscript{92} ECNI (2009) \textit{Equality Awareness Survey 2008}. ECNI: Belfast
\item \textsuperscript{93} ECNI (2012) \textit{Do you Mean Me? Discrimination: attitudes and experience in Northern Ireland. Equality Awareness Survey 2011}. ECNI: Belfast
\item \textsuperscript{94} ECNI (2009) \textit{Equality Awareness Survey 2008}. ECNI: Belfast
\item \textsuperscript{95} ECNI (2012) \textit{Do you Mean Me? Discrimination: attitudes and experience in Northern Ireland. Equality Awareness Survey 2011}. ECNI: Belfast
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
4.26 The disability category, which attracted the most negative responses in both 2008 and 2011, was mental ill-health. This category also experienced the highest increase, or hardening of attitude, in 2011 compared to 2008. In 2008, under a fifth displayed negative attitudes toward potential work colleagues with mental ill-health and this had increased to a quarter in 2011.

4.27 Whilst the views of respondents in 2008 were the same for both those with a physical disability and those with a learning disability at under a tenth, in 2011 those with a physical disability were viewed more negatively than those with a learning disability.

4.28 The 2009 Northern Ireland Life and Times Survey contained a module which asked about attitudes to disability. It found that respondents indicated there was ‘a lot’ (over a tenth of respondents) or ‘a little’ (over a half of respondents) prejudice against people with disabilities.

4.29 When asked to consider if they would accept someone with a disability as their boss a third of respondents to the NILTS (2009) stated that they would feel either fairly or very uncomfortable if that person were to have a mental health condition. Discomfort was also reported with regard to having

---

96 In 2008, 17.1% of respondents would mind ‘a little’ or ‘a lot’ having a potential colleague with mental ill-health compared to 25.8% in 2011.
99 In 2008, 8.2% of respondents would mind ‘a little’ or ‘a lot’ having a potential colleague with a learning disability or a physical disability.
100 In 2011 11.1% of respondents would mind ‘a little’ or ‘a lot’ having a potential colleague with a learning disability whilst 14.7% would mind ‘a little’ or ‘a lot’ having a potential colleague with a physical disability.
104 16% of respondents felt that there was ‘a lot’ of prejudice against people with disabilities, 57% thought there was ‘a little’ prejudice against people with disabilities.
105 25% of respondents felt ‘fairly uncomfortable’ with the idea of their boss having a mental health condition and 7% felt ‘very uncomfortable’ with this scenario.
a boss who had a learning disability although to a lesser extent at around a fifth of respondents\textsuperscript{106, 107}.

4.30 This stigma and prejudice may impact on the ability of people with disabilities to sustain employment, with disability-related discrimination complaints representing the highest number of enquiries, with respect to employment, to the Equality Commission’s Discrimination Advice Team\textsuperscript{108}.

**Inequalities and Differences**

**Inequality**

People with disabilities are more likely to be in part-time employment than those without disabilities.

4.31 In the UK, research has associated part-time work with low pay\textsuperscript{109}, the low wage economy, fragmented and unsocial hours\textsuperscript{110} and a higher risk of poverty\textsuperscript{111}.

4.32 Raeside *et al.* (2014) found that, at each time point between 2006 and 2012, rates of part-time employment for those with a disability were higher than for those without a disability\textsuperscript{112}.

4.33 The Commission’s analysis of LFS data over the period 2012 to 2016 found that rates of part-time employment for those with and those without a disability experienced some convergence between 2012 and 2013. However, in the last quarter of 2013 the gap between part-time rates of employment for those with a

\textsuperscript{106} 15\% of respondents felt ‘fairly uncomfortable’ with the idea of their boss having a learning disability and 6\% felt ‘very uncomfortable’ with this scenario.

\textsuperscript{107} ARK. Northern Ireland Life and Times Survey, 2009 ARK [www.ark.ac.uk/nilt](http://www.ark.ac.uk/nilt) June 2010.

\textsuperscript{108} Between April 2014 and March 2015, the Commission received 1380 legal enquiries on the grounds of disability (excluding SENDO). Enquiries on the grounds of disability represented 40.4\% of total enquiries (n=3413) received during this period and the highest number of enquiries received on any of the equality grounds.


disability compared to those without a disability widened\textsuperscript{113}. This led to a difference in part-time employment rates that was sustained until 2016; those with a disability had higher rates of part-time employment during this time\textsuperscript{114}.

When broken down into the four disability groups, the Commission found that, at most time points between 2012 and 2016, the part-time employment rates for those with a mental health and/or learning disability were too low to be considered\textsuperscript{115}. For the other groups, those with progressive or other disabilities\textsuperscript{116} were the most likely to work part-time, followed by those with physical and/or sensory disabilities\textsuperscript{117} and those with hidden disabilities\textsuperscript{118}.

\textsuperscript{113} The gap between those with a disability and those without a disability widened to 8.7 percentage points in Q4 2013; compared to 3.5 percentage points in Q3 2013.

\textsuperscript{114} In Q4 2013 those with a disability had a part time employment rate of 32.7% compared to a rate of 23.8% for those without a disability. In Q1 2016 the gap between the two groups was 7.2 percentage points: those with a disability had a part time employment rate of 30.5% compared to a rate of 23.3% for those without a disability.

\textsuperscript{115} They did not meet the minimum threshold of 8,000 individuals for reporting advised by NISRA.

\textsuperscript{116} In Q1 2012 36.3\% of those with progressive or other disabilities worked part time compared to: 43.8\% in Q1 2013; 40.1\% in Q1 2014; and, 41.8\% in Q1 2016. Q1 2015 had too few respondents to report upon i.e. it did not meet the 8,000 threshold for reporting advised by NISRA.

\textsuperscript{117} In Q1 2012 31.4\% of those with physical and/or sensory disabilities worked part time compared to: 31.6\% in Q1 2013; 25.8\% in Q1 2014; 21.5\% in Q1 2015; and, 29.9\% in Q1 2016.

\textsuperscript{118} In Q1 2012 16.0\% of those with hidden disabilities worked part time compared to: 18.9\% in Q1 2013; 28.6\% in Q1 2014; 20.0\% in Q1 2015; and, 25.8\% in Q1 2016.
5 Gender

5.1 In discussing gender differences and inequalities within the Northern Ireland labour market, it is not possible to view findings solely through a gender lens. This is most often the case when reasons for the inequalities and differences are explored; here, it is most often dependency status that comes into play, where females are more constrained in the labour market due to caring responsibilities.

Summary

5.2 There are inequalities in women’s participation in employment, which are linked to a women’s dependency status. In particular, women experience a lower employment rate and a higher economic inactivity rate when they have dependents. Factors explaining this are likely to be linked to the disproportionate share of caregiving by women, while the cost and availability of childcare is another factor influencing female participation in the work place.

5.3 In addition, women experience inequalities in participation in employment in some industries and occupations that may also impact on sustainability of employment. Women experience industrial and occupational segregation in employment. Women are under-represented in industries associated with Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) such as Manufacturing, Transport and Communication, Energy and Water and Construction.

5.4 Women are also under-represented in the highest paid and highest status occupations such as ‘Managers and Senior Officials’ and are over-represented in occupations that are more likely to be lower status and lower paid, such as ‘Personal Service’ and ‘Sales and Customer Service’. Moreover, women are more likely to report underemployment in their chosen occupation compared to men.

5.5 Caregiving has been suggested as one factor influencing occupational segregation with women choosing occupations allowing sufficient flexibility to balance the demands of caregiving. This may have a potential impact on the
sustainability of women’s employment, with women having to consider pay and career progression with flexibility in employment.

5.6 Linked to this there are inequalities in the sustainability of women’s employment, associated with part-time working. Women are more likely to be in part-time employment than men. While this is one of a number of means by which women balance employment with childcare, it can negatively impact on progression in employment, with women sometimes being perceived negatively for asking for flexible working. Women working part-time working are also at risk of low pay and precarious employment, as many part-time jobs are typically associated with the minimum wage and atypical contracts.

5.7 Trans people face prejudice and hostility in the workplace with ignorance of Trans issues from employers and work colleagues a key issue in sustaining employment.

5.8 There is also a data gap in relation to gender identity and the labour market in Northern Ireland with employment data related to Trans people severely lacking. Therefore, knowledge on the nature and severity of inequalities in the labour market for Trans people in Northern Ireland is not known.

Key Inequalities

5.9 As evidenced in this section, female participation in the Northern Ireland labour market is more limited than that of males. Females face a number of inequalities in, and barriers to, the labour market that males do not face and whilst some improvement has been made over time many of these inequalities and barriers remain persistent.

5.10 Whilst this section presents the differences, inequalities and barriers faced by females in Northern Ireland with regard to the labour market it is important to note that each is not freestanding, but rather are interlinked with one another. In other words, the experiences of females in the labour market do not exist in a vacuum; many factors interact to produce the outcomes observed.
Raeside et al.’s (2014) analysis of 2006 to 2012 Labour Force Survey (LFS) data showed that, between 2006 and 2012, males consistently had higher rates of employment\textsuperscript{119} than females\textsuperscript{120, 121, 122}. The Commission, through its analysis of LFS data, found that this was also evident between 2012 and 2016\textsuperscript{123, 124}.

Between 2006 and the 2009 the gender gap in employment rates decreased from between 12.8 and 13.9 percentage points in the years 2006 to 2008, to 9.9 percentage points in 2009\textsuperscript{125}. LFS data shows that the narrowing of the gender gap in employment during the recession was due to a fall in male employment rates; a fall which was twice that experienced by females\textsuperscript{126, 127}.

\textsuperscript{119} Employment is if someone worked at least one hour in the survey’s reference week. See Annex 1 for a fuller definition.

\textsuperscript{120} Raeside reported the rate of employment for males to be 74.1% in Q1 2006 and 71.6% in Q1 2012. Compared to this the rate reported for females was 64.6% in Q1 2006 and 67.3% in Q1 2012.

\textsuperscript{121} Raeside et al.’s (2014) analysis considered males aged 16-64 years old and females aged 16-59 years old.


\textsuperscript{123} The Commission found the rate of employment for males to be 71.5% in Q1 2012 and 75.1% in Q1 2016. In comparison the rates for females were 63.8% in Q1 2012 and 63.6% in Q1 2016.

\textsuperscript{124} The Commission’s analysis considered males and females aged 16-64 years old. Therefore, the proportions for females differ from Raeside et al (2014). In addition, slight difference in male employment rates may be due to rounding.

\textsuperscript{125} NISRA (2015) Quarterly Supplement to the Labour Market Report April – June 2015 Data Tables. Table QS2.1 Employment by sex, 16-64.

\textsuperscript{126} The decrease in employment rates for males was 6.3 percentage points, from 75.2% in April-June 2008 to 68.9% in April-June 2009. This was compared to a decrease of 3.2 percentage points for female employment rates, from 62.2% in April-June 2008 to 59.0% in April-June 2009.

\textsuperscript{127} NISRA (2015) Quarterly Supplement to the Labour Market Report April – June 2015 Data Tables. Table QS2 In employment.
5.13 The Commission’s analysis found that, between 2009 and 2016, the gender gap in employment remained fairly stable, ranging from 8.3 to 9.9 percentage points\(^{128, 129}\).

5.14 The 2011 Census showed that, if employment patterns in Northern Ireland were to be reflective of the population, females would account for a 50.6% share of those in employment and males a 49.4% share\(^{130}\). This was also shown to the case for NISRA’s 2015 population estimates, which reported that females continued to account for around half of the Northern Ireland population in 2015\(^{131, 132}\).

5.15 The Commission’s analysis of LFS data over the period 2012 to 2016, which considered the Census 2011 and NISRA’s 2015 population estimates, found that, at all-time points between 2012 and 2016, females were underrepresented in employment compared to males\(^{133, 134, 135}\). In addition, those females who were not in employment between 2006 and 2016 were most often economically inactive.

5.16 For a woman, the decision not to participate in the labour market due to family and/or home commitments is not a simple concept, with many different barriers and choices, both cultural, economic and personal underlying it.

5.17 These barriers discussed include: gender stereotypes; the social welfare system; qualifications and confidence; and, the affordability and accessibility of childcare.

5.18 McQuaid et al. (2013) found that attitudes towards the role of the mother as the primary caregiver prevail in Northern Ireland and may lead to the higher rates of economic inactivity.

---

\(^{128}\) The average percentage point difference between male and female rates of employment during the period April-June 2009 and April-June 2016 was 9.0 percentage points.

\(^{129}\) NISRA (2016) Quarterly Supplement to the Labour Market Report April – June 2016 Data Tables. Table QS2.1 Employment by sex, 16-64.

\(^{130}\) The Census 2011 showed that 50.6% and 49.4% of the working age population (16-64 years old) were female and male, respectively. Census Table CT0180NI: Usual residents in households aged 16 and over by age by sex.

\(^{131}\) The Commission’s calculations utilising the mid-year data found that the resident working age (16-64 years old) population was comprised of 50.5% females and 49.5% males.


\(^{133}\) The female share of employment in Northern Ireland ranged from 46.0% to 48.2% with an average of 47.3%.

\(^{134}\) Census Table CT0180NI: Usual residents in households aged 16 and over by age by sex.

experienced by females. For example, ‘the division of paid work and care in the household is often gendered, with mothers assuming greater responsibility for care work and fathers for earning’\textsuperscript{136}. Whilst McQuaid \textit{et al.} (2013) noted that some change has been made with regard to attitudes and practice ‘a stark asymmetry remains’\textsuperscript{137}.

5.19 The Committee on Women’s Rights and Gender Equality, also reported gender stereotypes as a barrier to female employment where ‘traditional gender roles and stereotypes continue to have a strong influence on the division of roles between men and women in the home, in the workplace and in society at large, with women depicted as running the house and caring for children while men are depicted as wage-earners and protectors’\textsuperscript{138}.

5.20 McQuaid \textit{et al.} (2013) caution that fathers may be hindered from taking on a caring role due to gender stereotypes and its interaction with ‘current unbalanced and poorly compensated parental leave arrangements’\textsuperscript{139}.

5.21 The Northern Ireland Executive (2016) cites that the ‘current social welfare system is a major structural barrier inhibiting labour market participation’ whereby the financial implications of work, even part-time work, can ‘make entering the labour market financially unattractive’\textsuperscript{140}. This was also noted in our 2007 Statement on Key Inequalities in Northern Ireland where we stated that ‘women are more likely to be reliant on means tested benefits’\textsuperscript{141}.

5.22 In addition, McQuaid \textit{et al.} (2013) caution that ‘women on benefits are unsure that work-based income would exceed their benefit-based incomes’\textsuperscript{142}, as benefits can be viewed as more

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{136} McQuaid, R., Graham, H. and Shapira, M (2013) \textit{Child Care: Maximising the Participation of Women}. Page 67.
\item \textsuperscript{137} McQuaid, R., Graham, H. and Shapira, M (2013) \textit{Child Care: Maximising the Participation of Women}. Page 67.
\item \textsuperscript{138} Committee on Women’s Rights and Gender Equality, European Parliament (2012) \textit{Report on eliminating Gender Stereotypes in the EU. (2012/2116(INI))}. Page 4-5.
\item \textsuperscript{139} McQuaid, R., Graham, H. and Shapira, M (2013) \textit{Child Care: Maximising the Participation of Women}. Page 86.
\item \textsuperscript{140} Northern Ireland Executive (2016) Programme for Government Delivery Plan: Indicators 17, 32, 33. Page 14.
\item \textsuperscript{141} ECNI (2007) \textit{Statement on Key Inequalities in Northern Ireland}. Page 11.
\item \textsuperscript{142} McQuaid, R., Graham, H. and Shapira, M (2013) \textit{Child Care: Maximising the Participation of Women}. Page 19.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
secure than work, avoiding the costs of childcare and the risk of potentially losing housing benefits.\textsuperscript{143}

5.23 Qualifications and confidence are also cited by McQuaid et al. (2013) as an issue for mothers from disadvantaged backgrounds where ‘low-skilled and low-paid jobs do not allow them to afford paid childcare and may offer low levels of flexibility to accommodate their caring responsibilities.’\textsuperscript{144}

5.24 Our 2007 Statement on Key Inequalities noted ‘difficulties in accessing affordable, quality childcare [which] further exacerbates the difficulties experienced by those (predominantly women) who wish to re-enter the labour market.’\textsuperscript{145}

5.25 The House of Commons (2016) more recently reported that ‘Childcare has an impact on women’s job opportunities, [whereby] women are more likely than men to consider these responsibilities before taking on a new job.’\textsuperscript{146}

5.26 McQuaid et al. (2013) also cite childcare as a barrier to female employment in Northern Ireland and highlights that, in Northern Ireland, there is ‘a lack of good quality, affordable childcare.’\textsuperscript{147}

5.27 In addition, McQuaid et al. (2013) note that, ‘if a significant portion of female-generated income is being spent on childcare, paid work is not worthwhile.’\textsuperscript{148} This is especially an issue in Northern Ireland, where it is reported that the ‘average childcare costs in Northern Ireland constitute 44% of an average income.’\textsuperscript{149} Horgan and Monteith (2009) found that not only is childcare in Northern Ireland scarce, but it is also the most expensive in the UK, except for in London.\textsuperscript{150}

\textsuperscript{143} McQuaid, R., Graham, H. and Shapira, M (2013) \textit{Child Care: Maximising the Participation of Women}.
\textsuperscript{144} McQuaid, R., Graham, H. and Shapira, M (2013) \textit{Child Care: Maximising the Participation of Women}. Page 20.
\textsuperscript{145} ECNI (2007) \textit{Statement on Key Inequalities in Northern Ireland}. Page 11.
\textsuperscript{147} McQuaid, R., Graham, H. and Shapira, M (2013) \textit{Child Care: Maximising the Participation of Women}. Page 1.
\textsuperscript{149} McQuaid, R., Graham, H. and Shapira, M (2013) \textit{Child Care: Maximising the Participation of Women}. Page 42.
5.28 Employers for Childcare (2010) also reported the lack of childcare in Northern Ireland. They found that, compared to other regions in the United Kingdom, Northern Ireland had one of the lowest levels of available childcare\(^\text{151}\).

5.29 The type of childcare may also differ according to socio-economic background. McQuaid et al. (2013) found that families that are more affluent are more likely to use private childcare whilst those from a more disadvantaged background are more reliant on state or voluntary sector childcare\(^\text{152}\).

---

**Inequality**

Females are more likely to be economically inactive than males.

---

5.30 The lower employment rate for women is supported by the identification of a higher rate of economic inactivity for women.

5.31 The Commission’s analysis of LFS data over the period 2006 to 2016 found that, females retained consistently higher rates of economic inactivity than males at each time point\(^\text{153}, \text{154}\). However, between 2006 and 2016 the gender gap in rates of economic inactivity decreased from 15.1 percentage points in 2006 to 11.8 percentage points in 2016\(^\text{155}, \text{156}\).

5.32 Comparing the economic inactivity rates for 2006 against those for 2016, the Commission found that the narrowing of the gender gap was related to a decrease, over time, in the proportion of females who were economically inactive, since

---

\(^{151}\) Employers for Childcare (2010) *Sizing up: A comparative study of childcare policies within the four regions of the UK.*

\(^{152}\) McQuaid, R., Graham, H. and Shapira, M (2013) *Child Care: Maximising the Participation of Women.*

\(^{153}\) The gender gap in April-June 2008 was 15.3 percentage points, this decreased by 3.5 percentage points to 11.8 percentage points in April-June 2016.


\(^{155}\) In April – June 2006 the difference between male and female economic inactivity rates was 15.1 percentage points; in April-June 2009 it was 13.4 percentage points; and, in April-June 2016, this had reduced to 11.8 percentage points.

male economic inactivity rates in 2016 were comparable to those of 2006\textsuperscript{157, 158}.

5.33 Research by the Northern Ireland Executive has found that ‘economic activity rates are lower amongst working age females the more dependent children they have’\textsuperscript{159}. Therefore, it is likely that economic inactivity and dependency status interact.

5.34 Barriers arising from caregiving may also explain why NISRA (2016) reported that the majority of females who were economically inactive did not want to work\textsuperscript{160, 161}. Our 2007 Statement on Key Inequalities in Northern Ireland\textsuperscript{162}, NISRA (2016), the 2011 Census, and Raeside \textit{et al.} (2014) highlighted that, for females, the main reason for not seeking work was due to family and/or home commitments\textsuperscript{163, 164, 165}. In contrast, the main reason given by males for economic inactivity was being sick or disabled and being a student\textsuperscript{166}; with the Census 2011 showing that under a tenth (6.9\%) of males were economically inactive due to family and/or home commitments\textsuperscript{167}.

\textsuperscript{157} The economic inactivity rate for males in April-June 2006 was 21.3\% compared to 20.6\% in April-June 2016; a decrease of 0.7 percentage points. In comparison the economic inactivity rate for females fell 4.0 percentage points, from 36.4\% in April-June 2006 to 32.4\% in April-June 2016.

\textsuperscript{158} NISRA (2015) Quarterly Supplement to the Labour Market Report April – June 2015 Data Tables. \textit{Table QS4 Economically inactive}.

\textsuperscript{159} Northern Ireland Executive (2016) Programme for Government Delivery Plan: Indicators 17, 32, 33. Page 42.

\textsuperscript{160} 82\% of economically inactive women did not want to work compared to 80\% of men, respectively.

\textsuperscript{161} NISRA (2016) \textit{Women in Northern Ireland 2016}.

\textsuperscript{162} ECNI (2007) \textit{Statement on Key Inequalities in Northern Ireland}.

\textsuperscript{163} Cited as 32\% of working age economically inactive females in NISRA (2016) \textit{Women in Northern Ireland 2016}.

\textsuperscript{164} Cited as 40.5\% of females in the 2011 Census Table T58: \textit{Theme table on economic activity}. This census table considers those aged 16 years old to pensionable age.


\textsuperscript{166} 37\% NISRA (2016) \textit{Women in Northern Ireland 2016}; and, 42.1\% in the 2011 Census Table T58: \textit{Theme table on economic activity}. This census table considers those aged 16 years old to pensionable age.

\textsuperscript{167} Census Table T58: \textit{Theme table on economic activity}. This census table considers those aged 16 years old to pensionable age.
It is not just a lack of childcare that is a barrier to women participating in employment. Finding employment, which ties in with the hours of childcare availability, is also an issue since the opening hours of childcare facilities and working times may not match. \(^{168}\) ‘\textit{Therefore low costs of childcare, or even free childcare, are not sufficient if mothers cannot adjust their working hours in a way that allows them to carry out their caring responsibilities}’\(^{170}\).

One of a number of means by which women balance employment with childcare is through part-time employment. However, women working part-time are at risk of low pay and precarious employment\(^{171}\), as part-time employment is typically associated with low pay, atypical contracts, the low wage economy, fragmented and unsocial hours and a higher risk of poverty\(^{176}\).

Raeside \textit{et al.} (2014) found that rates of part-time employment for males and females remained fairly constant between 2006

---

\(^{168}\) McQuaid, R., Graham, H. and Shapira, M (2013) \textit{Child Care: Maximising the Participation of Women.}


\(^{170}\) McQuaid, R., Graham, H. and Shapira, M (2013) \textit{Child Care: Maximising the Participation of Women. Page 16.}


\(^{172}\) A report (2016) by the House of Commons Women and Equalities Committee in Great Britain highlighted that women working part-time held 41% of minimum wage jobs, almost twice as high as their share of all jobs. HC Women and Equalities Committee (2016) Gender Pay Gap 2nd report of session 2015-2016.


and 2012\textsuperscript{177}. At each time point, Raeside \textit{et al.} (2014) found that females were much more likely than males to work in part-time employment\textsuperscript{178}. For example, in 2012 females were four times more likely to work in part-time employment than males\textsuperscript{179}.

5.38 The Commission’s analysis of LFS data over the period 2012 to 2016 mirrored Raeside \textit{et al.}'s (2014) finding from 2012\textsuperscript{180}. The Commission’s analysis found that females were in excess of three to four times more likely to work in part-time employment than males between 2012 and 2016. For example, at each time point, the proportion of females who worked part-time was a little under 40% compared to a little under 10% of males\textsuperscript{181}. This inequality is persistent, having been previously identified by the Commission in 2007\textsuperscript{182}.

5.39 The Northern Ireland Statistics and Research Agency (NISRA) (2016), reported that over three quarters of those who were in part-time employment in Northern Ireland were females; comparable to the rate in Great Britain (GB)\textsuperscript{183}.

5.40 Working part-time is, for many, a choice; evidenced by NISRA’s (2016) finding that nearly three quarters of females who worked part-time did not want a full-time job; also comparable to GB\textsuperscript{184}. However, the reasons for not wanting a part-time job may be due to the barriers to participation in the labour market that females face, particularly in relation to caregiving.

5.41 Mc Quaid \textit{et al.} (2013) caution that the same barriers that prevent females from becoming economically active may also


\textsuperscript{179}In Q1 2012 the part time employment rate for females (aged 16-59 years old in Raeside \textit{et al.}'s (2014) research) was 38.5% compared to 9.2% for males (aged 16-64 years old in Raeside \textit{et al.}'s (2014) research); the female rate was 4.1 times that of males.


\textsuperscript{181}The rates of part time employment for females were: 39.3% in Q1 2012; 39.8% in Q1 2013; 38.3% in Q1 2014; 36.7% in Q1 2015; and, 39.3% in Q1 2016. This was compared to rates of: 9.2% in Q1 2012; 10.8% in Q1 2013; 10.8% in Q1 2014; 9.4% in Q1 2015; and, 9.5% in Q1 2016 for males. In Q1 2016 the percentage point difference was 29.8 percentage points.

\textsuperscript{182}ECNI (2007) \textit{Statement on Key Inequalities in Northern Ireland}

\textsuperscript{183}79% and 77%, respectively. NISRA (2016) \textit{Women in Northern Ireland 2016}.

\textsuperscript{184}73% and 76%, respectively. NISRA (2016) \textit{Women in Northern Ireland 2016}.
encourage females to choose part-time employment\textsuperscript{185}. For example, females may work part-time to facilitate caring arrangements. In addition, traditional cultural attitudes that females should take ownership and responsibility for caring for the home and children may be at play\textsuperscript{186}.

5.42 Bashir \textit{et al.}'s (2011) research, for the Department for Work and Pensions, also found that, given their caring responsibilities, many females were \textit{only interested in part-time work}\textsuperscript{187} and reported a lack of appropriate employment with limited financial gains\textsuperscript{188}. In addition, Bashir \textit{et al.} (2011) also noted \textit{a widespread reluctance to use childcare}\textsuperscript{189} among some women.

5.43 Working part-time, however, can impact on a women’s progression in employment. In 2015, an Employers for Childcare survey\textsuperscript{190} reported that some working mothers, who have asked for flexible working such as part-time hours, have experienced a negative workplace culture, including being perceived as less committed, being viewed as not interested in career progression and being side-lined as a result.

5.44 Raeside \textit{et al.} (2014) noted that females and males were over-represented in some industries and under-represented in others between 2006 and 2012\textsuperscript{191}. The Commission noted that

\begin{center}
\textbf{Key Inequality}

Women experience industrial segregation
\end{center}

\textsuperscript{185} McQuaid, R., Graham, H. and Shapira, M (2013) \textit{Child Care: Maximising the Participation of Women.}
\textsuperscript{186} McQuaid, R., Graham, H. and Shapira, M (2013) \textit{Child Care: Maximising the Participation of Women.}
\textsuperscript{188} Bashir, N., Crisp, R., Gore, T., Reeve, K. and Robinson, D. (2011) \textit{Families and work: Revisiting barriers to employment.}
\textsuperscript{190} Employers for Childcare (2015) \textit{Striking the Balance: The impact becoming a parent has on employment, working life and career. Employers for Childcare: belfast}
there was little change in the period between 2012 and 2016. This is a persistent inequality.

5.45 Both Raeside et al. (2014) and the Commission found that females were mainly employed in two of the nine industry sectors at all time points considered: Public, Administration, Education and Health, and ‘Distribution, Hotels and Restaurants’. The sectors in which females were least likely to work were: ‘Agriculture and Fishing’; ‘Energy and Water’; and, ‘Construction’.

5.46 The 2011 Census shows that, if employment patterns in Northern Ireland were to be reflective of the population, females would account for 50.6% of those in employment and males 49.4%. This was also shown to the case for NISRA’s (2016) 2015 population estimates, which reported that females continued to account for around half of the Northern Ireland population in 2015.

5.47 The Commission found that between 2012 and 2016, there was only a slightly higher representation of female employees compared to males in the ‘Distribution, Hotels and Restaurants’ and ‘Other Services’ sectors compared to their proportionate share of the population. However, in the ‘Public, Administration, Education and Health’ sector there was

---

192 The Commission compared LFS data for industry and occupation sectors for: Q1 2012; Q1 2013; Q1 2014; Q1 2015; and, Q1 2016 in its analysis.
193 Between 2012 and 2016, the following proportion of females worked in the ‘Public, Administration, Education and Health’ sector: 51.3% in Q1 2012; 51.1% in Q1 2013; 49.6% in Q1 2014; 51.9% in Q1 2015; and, 47.2% in Q1 2016, respectively.
194 Between 2012 and 2016, the following proportion of females worked in the ‘Distribution, Hotels and Restaurants’ sector: 22.3% in Q1 2012; 22.5% in Q1 2013; 20.0% in Q1 2014; 20.8% in Q1 2015; and, 23.0% in Q1 2016, respectively.
195 The representation of females was so low in these three industries that their numbers could not be reported as they did not meet the minimum level for reporting set by NISRA.
196 The Census 2011 showed that 50.6% and 49.4% of the working age population (16-64 years old) were female and male, respectively. Census Table CT0180NI: Usual residents in households aged 16 and over by age by sex.
197 The Commission’s calculations utilising the mid-year data found that the resident working age (16-64 years old) population was comprised of 50.5% females and 49.5% males.
199 The ‘Distribution, Hotels and Restaurants’ sector employed the following proportions of females: 54.4% in Q1 2012; 51.9% in Q1 2013; 51.7% in Q1 2014; 53.2% in Q1 2015; and, 51.7% in Q1 2016.
200 The ‘Other Services’ sector employed the following proportions of females: 48.7% in Q1 2012; 60.7% in Q1 2013; 64.5% in Q1 2014; 52.2% in Q1 2015; and, 53.0% in Q1 2016.
201 Except for Q1 2013 and Q1 2014 when females accounted for a much higher proportion of the employees than males.
a disproportionately high representation of female employees at each time point\textsuperscript{203}.

5.48 Such high representation resulted in smaller proportions in the remaining industry sectors; again this was more keenly expressed in the ‘Agriculture and Fishing’; ‘Energy and Water’; and, ‘Construction’ sectors where few females were employed\textsuperscript{204}.

5.49 In comparison, males were highly overrepresented in two of the nine industry sectors: ‘Manufacturing’\textsuperscript{205}; and, ‘Transport and Communication’\textsuperscript{206}. This high level of male overrepresentation led to a corresponding underrepresentation of females in these same three sectors.

5.50 A comparison was not possible for three industry sectors due to the low number of females represented in the LFS data: ‘Agriculture and Fishing’; ‘Energy and Water’; and, ‘Construction’.

5.51 Many of the industries and sectors in which women are underrepresented are within Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics-based (STEM) industries.

5.52 The Science, Technology and Engineering Business Group (2013) cite that ‘in the Northern Ireland economy, high level STEM posts currently constitute over 11\% of the workforce, with men outnumbering women by nearly 3 to 1’ (authors emphasis)\textsuperscript{207}.

5.53 Further, men are more likely to enter into apprenticeships and there is a gender balance in certain types of apprenticeships:

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{203} The ‘Public, Administration, Education and Health’ sector employed the following proportions of females: 69.5\% in Q1 2012; 71.9\% in Q1 2013; 68.4\% in Q1 2014; 70.1\% in Q1 2015; and, 69.7\% in Q1 2016.
  \item \textsuperscript{204} The representation of females was so low in these three industries that their numbers could not be reported as they did not meet the minimum level of 8,000 for reporting set by NISRA.
  \item \textsuperscript{205} The ‘Manufacturing’ sector employed the following proportions of males: 77.3\% in Q1 2012; 79.0\% in Q1 2013; 74.5\% in Q1 2014; 78.4\% in Q1 2015; and, 81.9\% in Q1 2016.
  \item \textsuperscript{206} The ‘Transport and Communication’ sector employed the following proportions of males: 79.1\% in Q1 2012; 82.0\% in Q1 2013; 79.6\% in Q1 2014; 74.9\% in Q1 2015; and, 75.0\% in Q1 2016.
  \item \textsuperscript{207} STEM Business Group (2013) \textit{Addressing Gender Balance – Reaping the Gender Dividend in Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM)}, Page 1.
\end{itemize}
for example, women are under-represented in apprenticeships in STEM related areas²⁰⁸.

5.54 In addition, the Committee for Employment and Learning’s inquiry into careers advice and guidance (2013) were informed that only 4% of Technicians and 6% of Engineers in Northern Ireland were women²⁰⁹.

5.55 Stereotyping and bias within our culture and particularly within male-dominated engineering and technology sectors, has been cited as one factor in the under-representation of women within these industries²¹⁰.

5.56 In addition, young women are less likely to choose to study STEM subjects at further and higher education compared to young men²¹¹ thus decreasing their availability for high-level STEM jobs, where men outnumber women by nearly three to one²¹². However, it is understood that gender differences in subject choice emerge at an earlier stage of education; with gender differences in STEM subject choice reported at A-level²¹³ and, GCSE-level²¹⁴.

5.57 Gender stereotyped perceptions of STEM jobs as being traditionally “male” may influence the willingness of girls to pursue these courses and careers. For example, in 2014 the Girls Attitudes Survey²¹⁵ asked girls and young women between 11-21 years why more girls than boys drop STEM (Science, technology, engineering and maths) subjects despite being as competent as their male peers. Over half of the girls

and young women surveyed (56%) felt that STEM subjects have the image of being more for boys, while 42% felt that girls do not enjoy these subjects as much or perceive there to be too few female models in these roles in education (42%) and the work environment (40%)\textsuperscript{216}. Moreover, a third said that girls who are interested in these subjects are teased (33%), while 22% felt that teachers and careers advisors show gender bias in their advice and encouragement on subject choice\textsuperscript{217}.

5.58 In addition, a UK-based report from Ofsted found that from “an early age, the girls surveyed had held conventionally stereotypical views about jobs for men and women. They retained those views throughout their schooling despite being taught about equality of opportunity and knowing their rights to access any kind of future career”\textsuperscript{218}.

5.59 Some community projects have developed models to encourage women into non-traditional industries and occupations\textsuperscript{219}. Potter (2014) suggested that, while many approaches have been successful, some have assumed that women are a problem that needs transforming to fit a “male” work environment\textsuperscript{220}. Instead, these workplaces need to be transformed to be more receptive to all identities\textsuperscript{221}.

### Key Inequality

**Women experience occupational segregation**

5.60 In addition to being more likely to experience industrial segregation, Raeside et al. (2014) noted that females were also subject to occupational segregation between 2006 and 2012\textsuperscript{222}.

\textsuperscript{216} Ibid
\textsuperscript{217} Ibid
\textsuperscript{218} OFSTED (2011) Girls's Career Aspirations
The Commission’s analysis of LFS data over the period 2012 to 2016 found that this was a persistent inequality.

Both Raeside et al. (2014) and the Commission drew the same conclusions, that females were mainly employed in four of the nine occupation sectors at all time points considered: ‘Professional’; ‘Administrative and Secretarial’; ‘Personal Service’; and, ‘Sales and Customer Service’ occupations.

Only a small proportion of the female workforce were employed at the top occupational level of ‘Managers and Senior Officials’; with the proportion of women within these occupations decreasing between 2012 and 2016.

The occupation sectors in which females were less likely to work were: ‘Skilled Trades Occupations’ and ‘Process, Plant and Machine Operatives’.

The 2011 Census shows that, if employment patterns in Northern Ireland were to be reflective of the population, females would account for 50.6% of those in employment and males 49.4%. This was also shown to the case for NISRA’s (2016) 2015 population estimates, which reported that females

---

223 Occupational segregation was also noted in the monitored workforce within our 2007 Statement on Key Inequalities. ECNI (2007) *Statement on Key Inequalities in Northern Ireland*.


225 The following proportions of females were employed in ‘Professional Occupations’ between 2012 and 2016: 19.4% in Q1 2012; 21.0% in Q1 2013; 22.0% in Q1 2014; 22.6% in Q1 2015; and, 20.1% in Q1 2016, respectively.

226 The following proportions of females were employed in ‘Administrative and Secretarial’ occupations between 2012 and 2016: 21.3% in Q1 2012; 20.2% in Q1 2013; 19.4% in Q1 2014; 18.8% in Q1 2015; and, 16.8% in Q1 2016, respectively.

227 The following proportions of females were employed in ‘Personal Service’ occupations between 2012 and 2016: 16.5% in Q1 2012; 17.5% in Q1 2013; 19.0% in Q1 2014; 17.3% in Q1 2015; and, 16.7% in Q1 2016, respectively.

228 The following proportions of females were employed in ‘Sales and Customer Service’ occupations between 2012 and 2016: 11.8% in Q1 2012; 12.4% in Q1 2013; 10.6% in Q1 2014; 12.0% in Q1 2015; and, 14.7% in Q1 2016, respectively.

229 The following proportions of females were employed in ‘Managers and Senior Officials’ occupations between 2012 and 2016: 6.9% in Q1 2012; 6.2% in Q1 2013; 5.8% in Q1 2014; 5.2% in Q1 2015; and, 5.8% in Q1 2016, respectively.

230 The following proportions of females were employed in ‘Skilled Trades Occupations’ between 2012 and 2016: 2.3% in Q1 2012; 2.5% in Q1 2013; 2.4% in Q1 2014; 1.8% in Q1 2015; and, 2.6% in Q1 2016, respectively.

231 The representation of females was so low in ‘Process, Plant and Machine Operatives’ that their numbers could not be reported as they did not meet the minimum level for reporting set by NISRA.

232 The Census 2011 showed that 50.6% and 49.4% of the working age population (16-64 years old) were female and male, respectively. Census Table CT0180NI: *Usual residents in households aged 16 and over by age by sex*. 
continued to account for around half of the Northern Ireland population in 2015\textsuperscript{233}, \textsuperscript{234}.

5.65 The Commission found that, in each year between 2012 and 2016, compared to their proportionate share of the population\textsuperscript{235}, females were slightly overrepresented in 'Professional' occupations\textsuperscript{236}. Females were highly overrepresented in three occupations: 'Personal Service'\textsuperscript{237}, 'Administrative and Secretarial'\textsuperscript{238}, and, 'Sales and Customer Service'\textsuperscript{239} occupations.

5.66 In contrast, males were overrepresented in four out of the nine occupation sectors; this included the top level of 'Managers and Senior Officials'. For example, in this occupation sector six tenths of its 2016 workforce was male\textsuperscript{240}. The other sectors where males were overrepresented in 2016 were: 'Skilled Trades Occupations'\textsuperscript{241}, 'Elementary'\textsuperscript{242}; and, 'Associate, Professional and Technical'\textsuperscript{243} occupation sectors.

5.67 Raeside et al. (2014) state that ‘there is no definitive answer as to why occupational segregation exists, and the extent to which it is the product of choice’. A possible explanation that relates to the highest occupational level of 'Managers and Senior Officials' is that over half of female employees are in the ‘Public, Administration, Education and Health’ sector, which

\textsuperscript{233} The Commission’s calculations utilising the mid-year data found that the resident working age (16-64 years old) population was comprised of 50.5% females and 49.5% males.
\textsuperscript{234} NISRA (2016) \textit{2015 Mid-year Population Estimates for Areas within Northern Ireland.}
\textsuperscript{235} NISRA (2016) \textit{2015 Mid-year Population Estimates for Areas within Northern Ireland.}
\textsuperscript{236} The ‘Professional Occupations’ sector was made up of the following proportions of females: 49.6% in Q1 2012; 54.1% in Q1 2013; 54.0% in Q1 2014; 56.1% in Q1 2015; and, 53.0% in Q1 2016.
\textsuperscript{237} The ‘Personal Service’ occupations sector was made up of the following proportions of females: 84.9% in Q1 2012; 84.2% in Q1 2013; 87.2% in Q1 2014; 84.4% in Q1 2015; and, 77.5% in Q1 2016.
\textsuperscript{238} The ‘Administrative and Secretarial’ occupations sector was made up of the following proportions of females: 78.0% in Q1 2012; 78.6% in Q1 2013; 75.0% in Q1 2014; 70.9% in Q1 2015; and, 73.4% in Q1 2016.
\textsuperscript{239} The ‘Sales and Customer Service’ occupations sector was made up of the following proportions of females: 70.2% in Q1 2012; 68.7% in Q1 2013; 67.8% in Q1 2014; 67.5% in Q1 2015; and, 59.6% in Q1 2016.
\textsuperscript{240} The ‘Managers and Senior Officials’ occupations sector was made up of the following proportions of males: 62.2% in Q1 2012; 68.2% in Q1 2013; 57.5% in Q1 2014; 62.5% in Q1 2015; and, 61.6% in Q1 2016.
\textsuperscript{241} The ‘Skilled Trades Occupations’ sector was made up of the following proportions of males: 92.1% in Q1 2012; 90.6% in Q1 2013; 92.4% in Q1 2014; 93.7% in Q1 2015; and, 91.9% in Q1 2016.
\textsuperscript{242} The ‘Elementary’ occupations sector was made up of the following proportions of males: 59.7% in Q1 2012; 53.6% in Q1 2013; 56.7% in Q1 2014; 56.3% in Q1 2015; and, 55.2% in Q1 2016.
\textsuperscript{243} The ‘Associate Professional and Technical’ occupations sector was made up of the following proportions of males: 55.0% in Q1 2012; 56.3% in Q1 2013; 57.4% in Q1 2014; 57.7% in Q1 2015; and, 54.5% in Q1 2016.
'protects employees from downward occupation mobility, but restricts their upward mobility'\textsuperscript{244}; Schroeder et al. (2008) posit that managerial roles are found more often in the private sector\textsuperscript{245}.

5.68 Indeed, many people in employment in Northern Ireland consider themselves under-employed\textsuperscript{246}; with slightly more women workers under-employed compared with men\textsuperscript{247}.

5.69 The Women and Work Commission (2009) found that, due to taking time out of the labour market due to childcare or other caring roles, females often lack the confidence to work altogether or perhaps believe that their skills are so out of date that they opt to take a job that is below their skills level\textsuperscript{248}.

5.70 The House of Commons (2017) reports that ‘women are … still penalised for taking time out of work to have and raise children and are having to trade pay and career progression for flexibility’\textsuperscript{249}.

5.71 The reasons outlined above and the barriers to employment for females outlined in an earlier section may explain why Stennett and Murphy (2017) found that ‘a higher proportion of women choose occupations that offer less financial reward’ and are ‘less likely to progress up the career ladder into high paying senior roles’\textsuperscript{250}.

\textsuperscript{246} An under-employed person is defined as “a person, who is in employment, working less than 48 hours per week, would like to work more hours and is available to start in the next fortnight”. In 2015, in NI there were 53,000 underemployed workers or around 6.5% of all workers. See NISRA (2015) Underemployment in Northern Ireland. NISRA: Belfast.
\textsuperscript{247} In 2015, 7% of female workers were underemployed compared with 6% of male workers. See NISRA (2015) Underemployment in Northern Ireland. NISRA: Belfast.
\textsuperscript{250} Stennett A. and Murphy, E. (2017) Research Matters. How big is the gender pay gap in NI’s public and private sectors?
Inequalities and Differences

**5.72** Raeside et al. (2014) reported that ‘*males are much more likely than females to be self-employed in Northern Ireland by around 10 percentage points*’\(^{251}\). The Commission found that, between 2012 and 2016, a gap between the self-employment rates of males and females remained; females were consistently less likely to be self-employed than males\(^{252}\).

**5.73** A recent Commission report\(^{253}\), has noted that while there has been a rise in the number of self-employed women, the top three occupations for self-employed women are in the low paid areas of cleaning, childminding and hairdressing. Also, women remain the largest under-represented group in entrepreneurship in Northern Ireland.

---


252 The self-employment rates for males were: 18.9% in Q1 2012; 19.4% in Q1 2013; 21.5% in Q1 2014; 18.4% in Q1 2015; and, 16.9% in Q1 2016. This was compared to the following rates for females: 6.6% in Q1 2012; 5.5% in Q1 2013; 8.3% in Q1 2014; 4.8% in Q1 2015; and, 8.6% in Q1 2016.


254 No median full-time hourly pay gap excluding overtime was found in 2012, little difference was found in the following years: 1.5% in 2013; 1.1% in 2014; 1.5% in 2015; and, 3.2% in 2016 in favour of females.

255 No median full-time hourly pay gap excluding overtime was found in 2012, little difference was found in the following years: 1.5% in 2013; 1.1% in 2014; 1.5% in 2015; and, 3.2% in 2016.
Department of the Economy data has revealed that, in Northern Ireland, female median hourly earnings excluding over-time for full-time employees first became equal with male earnings in 2010. Since 2010, male and female earnings have been similar; and, in 2013, female median hourly earnings exceeded that of males for the first time. In 2016, the Commission’s analysis of ASHE data for part-time employees, found a gender pay gap in favour of part-time females, with median hourly earnings (excluding over-time) of part-time females 6.8% more than that of part-time males. Between 2012 and 2016, this gender pay gap persisted; with female part-time hourly pay excluding overtime greater than that of males at each time point.

While the gender pay gap for full-time and part-time employees was slightly in favour of females, the overall median hourly pay excluding over-time was found to be in favour of males. In 2012, Raeside et al.’s (2014) analysis of the median gross hourly pay excluding overtime found there to be a 9.4% gender pay in favour of males.

In addition, the Commission, through its analysis of ASHE data between 2012 and 2016 also found this to be the case. In 2016, a 9.1% pay gap in median hourly pay excluding overtime was identified with women (both full-time and part-time) earning 90.9% of the median hourly pay (excluding overtime) of men (both full-time and part-time).

This overall gender pay gap in median hourly pay (excluding overtime) in favour of men is a reflection of the part-time pay penalty. The Commission’s analysis of ASHE data found that while there is little difference between the median hourly pay (excluding overtime) of males and females there is a large pay gap.

---

257 In 2012 the gender pay gap in part-time gross hourly pay excluding overtime was 10.8%. The gender pay gap for the following years was: 9.1% in 2013; 5.5% in 2014; 3.3% in 2015; and, 6.8% in 2016.
258 i.e. including full-time and part-time employees.
259 Raeside et al.’s (2014) analysis differs from the Commission’s as Raeside et al. (2014) considered median gross hourly pay whereas the Commission considered median hourly pay excluding overtime.
260 The overall median gross hourly pay gap excluding overtime in 2012 was 9.4% in favour of males. The gender pay gap in the following years was: 9.5% in 2013; 10.7% in 2014; 11.7% in 2015; and, 9.1% in 2016.
gap between the median hourly pay (excluding overtime) of part-time and full-time workers. In 2016, the part-time pay penalty was 32%; with part-time workers earning a median of 68% of that of full-time workers (excluding over-time). This impacts disproportionality on women because, as identified previously in this section, women are three or four times more likely to work part-time than men²⁶¹.

5.80 It is generally accepted that it is females who are at the detrimental end of the gender pay gap; a pay gap which is largely ‘down to women’s concentration in part-time work,’ their ‘disproportionate responsibility for unpaid caring’ and the reality that ‘many of the sectors women work in, like retail and care, offer predominantly low-paid, part-time work²⁶².

5.81 However, the House of Commons (2016) also reports that other, much broader contributors, lead to the gender pay gap; such as: education, career choices and segregation in the labour market²⁶³. For example, given that females are less likely to work at the higher occupational levels ‘occupational segregation is widely acknowledged to be a key factor in the gender pay gap²⁶⁴.

5.82 Whilst males were less likely than females to be economically inactive, Raeside et al. (2014) and the Commission’s analysis of LFS data from 2006 to 2016 found that males were more

---

²⁶¹ In Q1, 2016, 39.3% of women worked part-time compared to 9.5% of males.
likely to be ILO unemployed\textsuperscript{265} than females. This is an emergent inequality\textsuperscript{266, 267}.

5.83 The Commission notes that whilst the rate of unemployment for both males and females increased between 2006 and 2016, males consistently experienced higher rates of unemployment than females at each time point between 2006 and 2016\textsuperscript{268, 269}.

5.84 McQuaid \textit{et al.} (2010) notes that, often in a recession, it is males who are most affected with regard to unemployment rates since the impacts of the recession on male dominated industry and occupation sectors may provide a barrier to males re-entering the labour market\textsuperscript{270}.

5.85 The Commission’s analysis of LFS data over the period 2006 to 2016 shows that McQuaid \textit{et al.}’s (2010) assertion was evident with regard to the 2009 recession\textsuperscript{271, 272}. The LFS data shows that an increase in rates of unemployment was experienced for both males and females in 2009 compared to 2008. However, whilst this increase was the largest experienced over the period by both males and females, it was greater for males than for females\textsuperscript{273, 274}.

\textsuperscript{265} International Labour Organisation unemployment refers to those without work but who are actively seeking working in the past four weeks; they are therefore economically active. For a fuller definition see Annex 1.

\textsuperscript{266} This inequality is considered to be emergent since it was not noted in the 2007 Statement on Key Inequalities in Northern Ireland.


\textsuperscript{268} The unemployment rate for males increased from 5.1\% in April-June 2006 to 7.2\% in April-June 2016; an increase of 2.1 percentage points. In comparison the unemployment rate for females increased from 2.8\% in April-June 2006 to 4.2\% in April-June 2016; an increase of 1.4 percentage points.

\textsuperscript{269} NISRA (2016) Quarterly Supplement to the Labour Market Report April – June 2016 Data Tables. \textit{Table QS1.1 Unemployment by sex, 16+}.

\textsuperscript{270} McQuaid \textit{et al.} (2010) \textit{Employment Inequalities in an Economic Downturn}.

\textsuperscript{271} McQuaid \textit{et al.} (2010) \textit{Employment Inequalities in an Economic Downturn}.

\textsuperscript{272} NISRA (2016) Quarterly Supplement to the Labour Market Report April – June 2016 Data Tables. \textit{Table QS1.1 Unemployment by sex, 16+}.

\textsuperscript{273} Data shows that the rate of unemployment increased by 3.2 percentage points for males in April-June 2009 compared to April-June 2008. For females the increase was 2.0 percentage points between April-June 2008 and April-June 2009.

\textsuperscript{274} NISRA (2016) Quarterly Supplement to the Labour Market Report April – June 2016 Data Tables. \textit{Table QS1.1 Unemployment by sex, 16+}. 
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In addition, the LFS data shows that unemployment rates for males and females in Northern Ireland have not yet returned to pre-recession levels\textsuperscript{275}.

Both Raeside et al. (2014) and the Commission found that, between 2006 and 2016, females were consistently less likely to work in the private sector than males\textsuperscript{276, 277}. LFS data shows that the proportion of males who worked in the private sector was higher than the proportion of females for each quarter of the years 2006 to 2016\textsuperscript{278}.

\textsuperscript{275} NISRA (2016) Quarterly Supplement to the Labour Market Report April – June 2016 Data Tables. 
\textbf{Table QS1.1 Unemployment by sex, 16+}.
\textsuperscript{277} The Commission’s analysis of LFS data by Quarter commencing in Q1 2012 and ending in Q1 2016.
\textsuperscript{278} In Q1 2006 the private sector employment rate for males was 77.8\% compared to 60.7\% for females. The private sector employment rate for males in Q1 2016 was 82.0\% compared to 61.6\% for females.
Trans People and Employment

Key Inequality

Employment data related to Trans people is severely lacking.

5.88 The consortium of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgendered voluntary and community organisations (2016) note that ‘robust research into trans populations needs to be commissioned’ due to a lack of estimates available for the Trans population279.

5.89 However, it is not just the size of the Trans population that is unknown. Given that data collected does not take into account any gender other than male or female, employment data relating to Trans people is severely lacking. The Commission was unable to find data relating to the employment of Trans people in Northern Ireland. Therefore, it was not possible to identify inequalities with regard to the same.

Key Inequality

Trans people face prejudice and hostility in the workplace

5.90 The Government Equalities Office (GEO) (2011) conclude from their United Kingdom based transgender survey that the biggest challenge faced by Trans people with regard to employment is ignorance280. Additionally, over a third of respondents to the GEO’s survey (2011) felt that ‘ignorance was the biggest problem amongst colleagues and other employees in their organisation’281. The Commission’s Equality

280 88% of the surveys 2,100 respondents believed ignorance was a challenge in employment.
Awareness Survey (2011) found that 35% of respondents would mind\textsuperscript{282} having a Trans person as a work colleague\textsuperscript{283}.

5.91 Research conducted with employers by Metcalf and Rolfe (2011) report that ‘\textit{in general, there is substantial ignorance about transgender and hostility towards transgender people}’ and that employers are often at a loss as to how to proceed with trans issues in the workplace\textsuperscript{284}.

5.92 Most respondents to the GEO’s survey (2011) cited a lack of gender focused help or assistance to find work, and that they faced a barrier to employment where employers were fearful of how their customers or clients would react toward a Trans employee\textsuperscript{285}. Of those respondents who were in employment half cited being the victim of harassment or discrimination in their current or previous employment\textsuperscript{286}. In addition, over half of respondents stated that their current or previous workplace did not have a Trans focused employment policy in place\textsuperscript{287}.

\textsuperscript{282} Either a little or a lot.
\textsuperscript{283} ECNI (2011) \textit{Equality Awareness Survey 2011}.
\textsuperscript{284} This research conducted qualitative interviews with 27 employers. Metcalf, H. and Rolfe, H. (2011) \textit{Barriers to employers in developing lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender - friendly workplaces}. Page viii.
\textsuperscript{285} 96\% and 86\%, respectively. Gender Equalities Office (2011) \textit{Transgender survey #3}.
\textsuperscript{286} Gender Equalities Office (2011) \textit{Transgender survey #3}.
\textsuperscript{287} Gender Equalities Office (2011) \textit{Transgender survey #3}. 
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6 Dependency Status

6.1 In considering dependency status, the draft Statement specifically considers those who are lone parents and those who are Carers.

6.2 As reported in our *Statement on Key Inequalities in Housing and Communities*, Russell (2013) notes that both the 2001 and 2011 censuses show that, in Northern Ireland, lone parents are overwhelmingly female.

6.3 This gender differential highlights prominently that it is impossible to separate the findings in the gender chapter from the findings presented here. Specifically, that the same barriers to female participation in the Northern Ireland labour market are applicable to female lone parents.

6.4 As stated by McQuaid et al. (2013) ‘lone parents experience amplified levels of the general barriers to childcare. Childcare is even less affordable on one income…. Similarly, the logistics of work and childcare are complicated enough with two parents, but when there is only one parent,… it is even harder to find an arrangement that works, especially with more than one child’.

6.5 Similarly, those who are Carers and provide unpaid care to dependents that are not children are likely to face similar issues in employment to those with childcare responsibilities.

6.6 A total of 214,000 (12%) of people were providing care on Census Day 2011, with 2015 mid-year population estimates indicating that around 218,000 people are Carers; with females constituting a greater share (59%) of those providing unpaid care.

---

288 Census 2011 notes that a “a person is a provider of unpaid care is they give any help or support to family members, friends, neighbours or other because of long-term physical health or disability, or problems related to old age”.


290 ECNI (2017) *Statement on Key Inequalities in Housing and Communities in Northern Ireland*. Page 47. ECNI: Belfast
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6.7 According to Census 2011, over half of Carers (57%) provide unpaid care for between 1-19 hours per week, 16.5% provide 20-49 hours of unpaid care a week, while 26.3% of Carers provide 50 or more hours unpaid care per work. In addition, when the age profile of Carers is considered, the majority (81%) of Carers are of working age, between 18-64 years old.

**Summary**

6.8 There are inequalities in the participation of lone parents and carers in employment, which are similar to those identified for women in the section on gender. In particular, lone parents with dependents experience barriers to their participation in employment, with a lower employment rate and a higher economic inactivity rate, particularly for females who constitute the majority of lone parents.

6.9 The cost and availability of childcare is a factor influencing participation in the work place, however, barriers are further compounded for lone parents who have sole responsibility for the financial and physical care of their child. Lone parents also face a psychological barrier to childcare given their responsibility as sole caregiver for the child.

6.10 In addition, carers experience barriers to participating in employment, which increase with the volume of care provided. Carers who provide more than 20 hours of care per week are less likely to be in employment and more likely to be economically active than those who do not provide care.

6.11 For carers, a lack of flexibility in the workplace to enable them to manage caring responsibilities and a lack of suitable care services are major barriers to participation. However, attitudinal barriers to carers from employers and work colleagues also represent a barrier to employment.

6.12 There are inequalities in the sustainability of employment for lone parents and carers in employment, which are similar to those identified for women in the section on gender. Lone parents experience occupational segregation in employment. Lone parents are over-represented in occupations that are lower status and lower paid, such as
‘Sales and Customer’ occupations (in 2006 and 2012) and ‘Personal Service’ occupations (in 2012-2016).

6.13 Similar to the experiences of women, caregiving has been identified as one factor influencing occupational segregation with lone parents choosing occupations, which allow sufficient flexibility to balance the demands of caregiving. This may have a potential impact on the sustainability of a lone parent’s employment, with lone parents having to consider pay and career progression with flexibility in employment.

6.14 Similarly, there are also inequalities in the sustainability of a lone parent’s employment, associated with part-time working. Lone parents with dependents are more likely to be in employment on a part-time basis than those with no dependents or couples with dependents. This is another means by which lone parents can balance employment with childcare, however, as identified with women; it can negatively impact on progression in employment. As identified in the section on gender, working part-time may place a lone parent at risk of low pay and precarious employment, as many part-time jobs are typically associated with the minimum wage and atypical contracts.

6.15 There are inequalities in the sustainability of carer’s employment, associated with part-time working. Carers who provide less than 49 hours of unpaid care are more likely to work part-time than those who do not provide care. Similar to lone parents, this is a means by which carers can balance employment with caring responsibilities. However, it can negatively impact on career progression, with many carers taking a less qualified, lower paid job or turning down promotion to care.

6.16 Given that the structural barriers to employment faced by both women and/or lone parents, are often primarily due to their caregiving role, it should be noted that, addressing these barriers to labour market participation for women will also address those experienced by lone parents.
Key Inequalities – Lone Parents

Key Inequality

Lone parents with dependents experience barriers to their participation in employment.

6.17 Raeside et al. (2014) found that in 2006 and 2012 lone parents had the lowest rates of employment compared to each of the other dependency status groups considered. The gap between lone parents with dependent children and those who were married or co-habiting with dependent children increased slightly in 2012 compared to 2006\(^{293}\), whereas the gap between lone parents with dependent children and those with no dependent children remained stable\(^{294}\).

6.18 The Commission found that this trend continued between 2012 and 2016. LFS data over the period 2012 to 2016 evidenced consistently lower rates of employment for lone parents with dependent children than either those who were married or co-habiting with dependent children or those with no dependent children.

6.19 The gap between those who were married or co-habiting with dependent children and lone parents with dependent children decreased over the period but remained substantial at 24.4 percentage points in 2016\(^{295}\). Likewise, the gap between those who had no dependent children and lone parents with dependent children decreased, to a lesser extent, between

---

\(^{293}\) Raeside et al. (2014) reported the rates of employment for those who were married or co-habiting with dependent children to be 70.4% in Q1 2006 and 74.3% in Q1 2012 compared to 45.4% and 41.7%, respectively for lone parents; resulting in a gap of 25.0 percentage points in 2006 and 32.6 percentage points in 2012.

\(^{294}\) Raeside et al. (2014) reported the rates of employment for those with no dependent children to be 72.6% in Q1 2006 and 70.9% in Q1 2012; a gap of 27.2 percentage points in Q1 2006 and 29.2 percentage points in Q1 2012 when compared to lone parents with dependent children.

\(^{295}\) Those who were married or co-habiting with dependent children maintained the following rates of employment: 74.3% in Q1 2012; 71.5% in Q1 2013; 72.5% in Q1 2014; 73.3% in Q1 2015; and, 74.4% in Q1 2016. This was compared to the following rates for lone parents with dependent children: 41.8% in Q1 2012; 49.2% in Q1 2013; 45.6% in Q1 2014; 46.7% in Q1 2015; and, 50.0% in Q1 2016.
2012 and 2016 but remained substantial at 19.5 percentage points in 2016\footnote{Those with no dependent children maintained the following rates of employment: 67.1\% in Q1 2012; 66.3\% in Q1 2013; 68.7\% in Q1 2014; 68.6\% in Q1 2015; and, 69.5\% in Q1 2016.}

6.20 As reported in our \textit{Statement on Key Inequalities in Housing and Communities}, Russell (2013) notes that both the 2001 and 2011 censuses show that, in Northern Ireland, lone parents are overwhelmingly female\footnote{92\% in 2001 and 91\% in 2011. Russell, R. (2013) \textit{Census 2011: Key Statistics at Northern Ireland and LGD level.}}.\footnote{ECNI (2017) \textit{Statement on Key Inequalities in Housing and Communities in Northern Ireland.} Page 47. ECNI: Belfast} This finding is also reflected in the LFS data as the Commission found that the number of male lone parents with dependent children were too low to analyse\footnote{The number of male lone parents with dependent children did not meet the 8,000 threshold set by NISRA at most time points between 2012 and 2016.}

6.21 Whilst the low numbers of male lone parents prohibited any analysis on this basis, the other marital status categories were well represented for each gender, including female lone parents. The Commission found that, at each time point between 2012 and 2016, female lone parents had the lowest rates of employment of all groups. Only around half of female lone parents\footnote{The rates of employment for female lone parents were: 47.8\% in Q1 2012; 51.0\% in Q1 2013; 49.0\% in Q1 2014; 49.2\% in Q1 2015; and, 51.2\% in Q1 2016.} were in employment between 2012 and 2016, compared to over three fifths (over 60\%) of females\footnote{The rates of employment for females with no dependent children were: 65.4\% in Q1 2012; 67.2\% in Q1 2013; 67.4\% in Q1 2014; 64.8\% in Q1 2015; and, 64.2\% in Q1 2016.} with no dependents, males\footnote{The rates of employment for males with no dependent children were: 68.6\% in Q1 2012; 65.4\% in Q1 2013; 69.8\% in Q1 2014; 72.0\% in Q1 2015; and, 74.2\% in Q1 2016.} with no dependents, and females who were married or co-habiting with dependents\footnote{The rates of employment for females who were married or co-habiting with dependent children were: 67.9\% in Q1 2012; 63.4\% in Q1 2013; 67.23\% in Q1 2014; 68.5\% in Q1 2015; and, 68.9\% in Q1 2016.}\footnote{The rates of employment for males who were married or co-habiting with dependent children were: 80.3\% in Q1 2012; 78.9\% in Q1 2013; 77.3\% in Q1 2014; 77.6\% in Q1 2015; and, 79.1\% in Q1 2016.}. In comparison, over three quarters (over 75\%) of males who were married or co-habiting with dependents were in employment\footnote{The rates of employment for males who were married or co-habiting with dependent children were: 80.3\% in Q1 2012; 78.9\% in Q1 2013; 77.3\% in Q1 2014; 77.6\% in Q1 2015; and, 79.1\% in Q1 2016.}.
The lower employment rate of lone parents with dependent children is supported by the identification of a higher rate of economic inactivity for lone parents.

Both Raeside et al. (2014) and the Commission, through analysis of LFS data over the periods 2006 to 2012 and 2012 to 2016 found that lone parents with dependent children have much higher rates of economic inactivity than those who have no dependents and those who are married or co-habiting with dependent children.

Raeside et al. (2014) found that in 2006 and 2012 the economic inactivity rates for lone parents with dependent children were around twice that of those who were married or co-habiting with dependent children and those who had no dependent children.

Similarly, the Commission found that, between 2012 and 2016, economic inactivity rates for lone parents with dependent children were around twice that of those who were married or co-habiting with dependent children.

---

306 Raeside et al.'s (2014) analysis focused on data over the period 2006 to 2012 whilst the Commission’s focused on data over the period 2012 to 2016.
307 49.6% of lone parents with dependent children were economically inactive in Q1 2006 compared to 51.1% in Q1 2012.
308 27.5% of those who were married or co-habiting with dependent children were economically inactive in Q1 2006 compared to 22.7% in Q1 2012.
309 23.7% of those who had no dependent children were economically inactive in Q1 2006 compared to 22.6% in Q1 2012.
311 The rates for lone parents with dependent children were: 51.0% in Q1 2012; 43.9% in Q1 2013; 44.9% in Q1 2014; 44.1% in Q1 2015; and, 43.4% in Q1 2016.
co-habiting with dependent children and those who had no dependent children.

6.26 McQuaid et al. (2013) note that, in addition to the childcare barriers most notably experienced by females in the Northern Ireland labour market, lone parents also have ‘a psychological barrier to using childcare… [given their] sole responsibility for a child’.

Key Inequality

Lone parents with dependents are more likely to be in employment on a part-time basis

6.27 Raeside et al. (2014) found that lone parents with dependent children were more likely to work part-time than the other dependency groups. For example, between 2006 and 2012, Raeside et al. (2014) reported that over half (51.1%) of lone parents with dependent children were in part-time employment, compared to around a quarter (24.1%) of married or co-habiting parents with dependent children and 15.2% of those with no dependent children.

6.28 The Commission’s analysis of LFS data over the period 2012 to 2016 also found that lone parents with dependent children had the highest rates of part-time employment. Between 2012 and 2016 around half to three fifths (50%-60%) of lone parents with dependent children were in part-time employment compared to around a quarter (25%) of those who were married or co-
habiting with dependent children and a fifth (20%)\textsuperscript{318} for those who had no dependent children\textsuperscript{319}.

### Key Inequality

**Lone parents with dependent children experience occupational segregation in employment**

6.29 Raeside et al. (2014) identified that lone parents with dependent children were more likely to be employed in the ‘Sales and Customer Service’ occupations in 2006 and the ‘Administrative and Secretarial’ occupations in 2012\textsuperscript{320}. The Commission however, found that, between 2012 and 2016 the representation of lone parents with dependent children was too low at many time points in these sectors to report upon.

6.30 The Commission did identify occupational segregation for lone parents with dependent children between 2012 and 2016, but the occupation sectors were different to those identified by Raeside et al. (2014). Through its analysis of LFS data over the period 2012 to 2016, the Commission found that lone parents with dependent children were mostly employed in two occupation sectors: ‘Personal Service Occupations’\textsuperscript{321} and ‘Elementary Occupations’\textsuperscript{322}. In all other sectors, the representation of lone parents with dependent children in the LFS was too low to report upon.

6.31 The 2011 Census shows that, if employment patterns in Northern Ireland were to be reflective of the population, those in ‘lone couple families’\textsuperscript{323} would account for 5.9% of those in

\textsuperscript{318} For example, in Q1 2012 26.1% of those who were married or co-habiting with dependent children were in part-time employment, this was compared to: 26.3% in Q1 2013; 23.3% in Q1 2014; 22.8% in Q1 2015; and, 24.1% in Q1 2016.

\textsuperscript{319} For example, in Q1 2012 18.6% of those who had no dependent children were in part-time employment, this was compared to: 20.2% in Q1 2013; 21.0% in Q1 2014; 18.0% in Q1 2015; and, 17.1% in Q1 2016.


\textsuperscript{321} In Q1 2012 23.2% of lone parent employees were employed in the ‘Personal Service Occupations’, this was compared to: 23.2% in Q1 2013; 22.5% in Q1 2014; 20.2% in Q1 2015; and, 17.1% in Q1 2016.

\textsuperscript{322} In Q1 2013 21.4% of lone parent employees were employed in the ‘Elementary Occupations’, this was compared to: 18.0% in Q1 2014; 18.6% in Q1 2015; and, 15.0% in Q1 2016.

\textsuperscript{323} equated to lone parents with dependent children
employment. In comparison, those in a ‘couple family’\textsuperscript{324} accounted for 79.5% of those in employment, whilst those ‘not in a family’\textsuperscript{325} accounted for 14.6% of those in employment\textsuperscript{326}.

6.32 The Commission found that, in each year between 2012 and 2016, compared to their proportionate share of the employed population, lone parents with dependent children were overrepresented in ‘Personal Service Occupations’\textsuperscript{327}; a small overrepresentation was also possible in ‘Elementary Occupations’, however, the percentage point difference was not great enough to make any clear inferences.

\textit{Key Inequalities – Carers}

\textbf{Key Inequality}

\textit{Carers experience barriers to participating in employment.}

6.33 The Commission noted that Labour Force Statistics data does not include unpaid care as a variable. Therefore, no analysis of LFS data was possible with regard to carer status and employment. However, the Commission considered Census 2011 data on employment and unpaid care.

6.34 The Commission’s analysis of Census 2011 data revealed that those who provide more than 20 hours of unpaid care were proportionately less likely to be in employment than those who did not provide unpaid care. On Census day 2011, 54.8\% of carers who provided 20-49 hours per week of unpaid care and 36.8\% of those who provided more than 50 hours per week of unpaid care were in employment compared to 68.2\% of those who were not carers\textsuperscript{328}.

\textsuperscript{324}equated to those who were married or co-habiting with dependent children
\textsuperscript{325}That is, those with no dependent children
\textsuperscript{326}Census Table T58: \textit{Theme table on economic activity}. This census table considers those aged 16 years old to pensionable age.
\textsuperscript{327}In Q1 2012 lone parents with dependent children made up 13.9\% of the workforce, this was compared to 15.2\% in Q1 2013; 13.3\% in Q1 2014; 12.7\% in Q1 2015; and, 12.6\% in Q1 2016.
\textsuperscript{328}See Census 2011: Table DC3302Ni: Economic Activity by General Health by Provision of Unpaid Care by Sex. Interestingly, carers who provided 1-19 hours per week of unpaid care were
Evidence from the NILTS 2015 supports the finding that those who provided the greatest volumes of care in hours per week were less likely to be in employment. Devine and Gray (2016) found that “just under one half of carers taking part in the 2015 NILT survey were in work (46%) and they were less likely than other carers to provide care for at least 35 hours per week”\(^{329}\).

UK-based research conducted by Carers UK (2016)\(^{330}\) has revealed that carers face considerable barriers to employment that impact on their ability to participate in employment. According to the State of Caring 2016 survey, ‘many working carers find they go months or even years without a real break’\(^{331}\). The majority (70%) of working carers in the survey had used their annual leave to care and almost half (48%) had used overtime to make up hours spent caring. In addition, many working carers face a lack of understanding from colleagues and managers\(^{332}\). In addition, research by Jopling (2016) has highlighted that many carers want to remain in work for financial, health and wellbeing reasons. However, they faced barriers such as a lack of flexibility in the workplace and attitudinal barriers. These strains resulted in some carers giving up work, resulting in negative impacts on their finances, health and wellbeing\(^{333}\).

---

### Inequality

Carers who provide greater than 20 hours unpaid care are more likely to be economically inactive.

---

The lower employment rate of carers is supported by the identification of a higher rate of economic inactivity for carers.


The Commission’s analysis of Census 2011 data revealed those who provide more than 20 hours of unpaid care were proportionately more likely to be economically active than those who did not provide unpaid care. On Census day 2011, 40.0% of carers who provided 20-49 hours per week of unpaid care and 60.1% of those who provided more than 50 hours per week of unpaid care were economically inactive compared to 33.5% of those who were not carers.

In addition, according to Census 2011, carers who provided 1-19 hours of care per week (4.1%), 20-49 hours of care per week (13.9%) and more than 50 hours of care per week (21.7%) were more likely to say they were economically inactive due to family and home commitments compared to those who did not provide unpaid care (3.4%).

According to the State of Caring 2016 survey, half (49%) of carers who responded to their survey had given up work due to care. Of those that gave up work, retired early or reduced working hours, 69% said the stress of juggling work and care was a contributing factor, 31% said it was because there was no suitable care services, 21% said care services were too expensive, 16% said that annual leave was insufficient to juggle caring and working and, 18% were unable to negotiate suitable working hours.

**Key Inequality**

Carers who provide less than 49 hours of unpaid care are more likely to work part-time employment.

The Commission’s analysis of Census 2011 data revealed those who provide less than 49 hours of unpaid care were proportionately more likely to work part-time than those who did not provide unpaid care.

---

334 See Census 2011: Table DC3302NI: Economic Activity by General Health by Provision of Unpaid Care by Sex. Interestingly, carers who provided 1-19 hours per week of unpaid care were proportionately less likely to be economically inactive (23.0%) compared to those who were not Carers (33.5%).

335 See Census 2011: Table DC3302NI: Economic Activity by General Health by Provision of Unpaid Care by Sex.


not provide unpaid care. On Census day 2011, 18.3% of those who provided 1-19 hours care per week and 15.3% of carers who provided 20-49 hours care per week worked part-time compared to 12.6% of those who were not carers.\(^{338}\)

6.42 The State of Caring 2016 survey found that among carers in paid work, half (50%) had reduced their hours to care, while 39% had taken a less qualified job or turned down a promotion.\(^{339}\) According to Carers UK ‘among those currently juggling work and care, many have already taken steps to reduce paid work and will have limited choices if their caring responsibilities increase.’\(^{340}\)

---

338 See Census 2011: Table DC3302NI: Economic Activity by General Health by Provision of Unpaid Care by Sex. Carers who provided over 50 hours per week of unpaid care were proportionately less likely to work full-time and part-time (18.1% and 12.2%) compared to those who were not Carers (36.0% and 12.6% respectively)

339 See Census 2011: Table DC3302NI: Economic Activity by General Health by Provision of Unpaid Care by Sex.

7 Ethnicity

7.1 The Commission’s consideration of 2011 Census data found that the vast majority of those in Northern Ireland were White\textsuperscript{341}, with very small representations of: Irish Travellers; Asian; Black; Mixed; or, Other groups\textsuperscript{342, 343}. In addition, migrant workers from the A2 and A8 European Union Accession countries represented 2.1\% of population\textsuperscript{344}.

7.2 However, Irwin et al. (2014) caution that Census data, whilst ‘the most accurate dataset available on ethnic minorities in Northern Ireland … is still likely to be an underestimation of the numbers of ethnic minority population’\textsuperscript{345}.

7.3 For example, the Census 2011 cites the number of Irish Travellers in 2011 to be 1,301,754 of whom were aged between 16 and 74 years old. However, estimates from the All Ireland Traveller Health Study (2010) cite the number to be 3,905 Irish Travellers, living in 1,562 families\textsuperscript{346}. Scullion and Rogers (2014) believe that the differences in estimates of the Irish Traveller population ‘arise from the Census only counting those who self-identified or those whom the methodology ascertained to be Travellers’\textsuperscript{347}. Regardless of the reasoning, it is fair to surmise that the true size of the Irish Traveller population in Northern Ireland is unknown.

7.4 Whilst the Labour Force Survey (LFS) includes data on different ethnic groups, the numbers of those in minority ethnic groups in Northern Ireland are at such a low level that an analysis may not be reliably undertaken at an individual group

\textsuperscript{341} The proportion calculated for the White category excluded Irish Travellers. White accounted for 98.2\% of those aged 16-64 years old in the Northern Ireland population at the time of the Census.

\textsuperscript{342} 0.1\% of the population were Irish Travellers at the time of the Census; 1.2\% were Asian; 0.2\% were Black; 0.2\% were Mixed; and, 0.1\% were Other.

\textsuperscript{343} Census Table DC2601NI: Economic Activity by Ethnic Group by Age by Sex.

\textsuperscript{344} Whilst the LFS category is ‘Eastern Europe’ for country of birth the most comparable data from the Census 2011 is from EU Accession countries from 2004 onwards. However, this does not only include Eastern European countries but also Cyprus and Malta. Census Table CT0116NI: Country of Birth by Age by Sex.

\textsuperscript{345} Irwin, J., McAreeavey, R. and Murphy, N. (2014) The economic and social mobility of ethnic minority communities in Northern Ireland, Page 56.

\textsuperscript{346} All Ireland Traveller Health Study Our Geels.

level. In addition, the LFS does not include an ethnicity category of Irish Traveller. To this end, no LFS data could be analysed with regard to Irish Travellers.

7.5 As a consequence of low, or unknown numbers, little data is available on minority ethnic groups with regard to employment in Northern Ireland. As a result, this draft Statement attempts to draw conclusions from the Census 2011 data and research literature by utilising the following minority ethnic groupings: Irish Travellers; White; Asian; Black; Mixed; and, Other. With regard to LFS data, where possible, data will be analysed by the following minority ethnic groupings, which take account of country of origin/birth: UK and Ireland; Eastern European; and, Others.

Summary

7.6 Irish Travellers face considerable barriers to participation in employment. Irish Travellers are less likely to be in employment than all other ethnic groups and are more likely to be economically inactive than all other ethnic groups. Female Travellers, in particular, are less likely to participate in employment and are more likely to be economically inactive than male Travellers and females from all other ethnic groups.

7.7 Low educational attainment, prejudice and discrimination in the labour market, a greater traditional emphasis on family and home, and cultural resistance to the use of formal childcare are all major barriers to the participation of Irish Travellers in employment.

7.8 Migrant workers face considerable barriers to sustaining employment and progressing in employment. Migrant workers, particularly those from Eastern European countries, are subject to industrial and occupational segregation, with migrant workers over-represented in low paid, low status jobs, and in low-paid industry sectors.

7.9 Migrant workers are vulnerable to exploitation, which can impact on their ability to sustain employment and progress in employment. Many migrant workers who are agency workers

---

348 The Department for Finance advised the Commission that numbers under 8,000 are considered low.
are confined to temporary and irregular work, including zero-hour contracts. Many face poorer terms and conditions than local workers and are vulnerable to poor employment practices. In addition, human trafficking is an issue in Northern Ireland, with evidence of practices that constitute forced labour of migrant workers.

7.10 People from minority ethnic groups and migrant workers are subject to prejudice and discrimination both within and outside the workplace, with prejudicial attitudes expressed toward Irish Travellers, migrant workers and minority ethnic groups. Racial prejudice and discrimination can impact on the ability of minority ethnic groups and migrant workers to participate in employment, stay in employment and progress in employment. Racial prejudice has been identified in accessing employment and in experiences of racial harassment and intimidation in workplaces.

Key Inequalities

Irish Travellers are less likely to be in employment than all other ethnic groups.

7.11 Raeside et al. (2014) reported that, whist empirical data is lacking, the ‘picture presented from the literature and interests groups is that Irish Travellers have much lower employment… rates than those classed in any other group’349.

7.12 The Commission undertook an analysis of Census 2011 data. This analysis showed that, at the time of the Census, Irish Travellers had the lowest employment rates of all minority ethnic groups considered350. The data showed that only a fifth of Irish Travellers counted in the Census were in employment compared to over half of all other minority ethnic groups351, 352.

350 Minority ethnic groups considered were: White; Irish Traveller; Asian; Black; Mixed; and, Other.
351 20.0% of Irish Travellers were employed compared to: 57.6% of White; 64.0% of Asian; 56.7% of Black; 54.4% of Mixed; and, 58.5% of Other ethnic groups.
352 Census Table DC2601NI: Economic Activity by Ethnic Group by Age by Sex.
When gender was considered, the Commission found both male and female Irish Travellers experienced low employment rates, although female Irish Travellers had lower employment rates (16.0%) than male Irish Travellers (24.1%).

Male Irish Travellers had lower employment rates than males in other minority ethnic groups; with the gap ranging from 30.4 to 45.1 percentage points. Likewise, female Irish Travellers also had lower employment rates than females in other minority ethnic groups; the gap here ranged from 36.0 to 42.5 percentage points.

Irwin et al. (2014) reported that one of the ‘key barriers experienced by Travellers were reported to be perceived discriminatory attitudes from employers, preventing them [from] gaining meaningful employment’.

These discriminatory attitudes can be formed from an Irish Traveller’s ‘accent, address and name’. For example, Cemlyn et al. (2009) reported that ‘evidence from across the UK indicates that Gypsies and Travellers who live on a site, or who are known to be members of local Gypsy or Traveller families, encounter discrimination when applying for paid work’. Cemlyn et al. (2009) also note that ‘examples abound of people not being called for interviews or of jobs being mysteriously filled’.

A further barrier highlighted by Irwin et al. (2014) was that nearly seven tenths of Irish Travellers captured in the Northern Ireland Census 2011 did not have any qualifications. Michael (2016) also believes that the low levels of employment for Irish Travellers is linked to their lack of qualifications.

---

353 Males in each ethnic group had the following employment rates: 61.1% for White; 24.1% for Irish Travellers; 69.2% for Asian; 58.6% for Black; 54.5% for Mixed; and, 62.2% for Other ethnic groups.

354 Females in each ethnic group had the following employment rates: 54.2% for White; 16.0% for Irish Travellers; 58.5% for Asian; 53.9% for Black; 54.2% for Mixed; and, 52.0% for Other ethnic groups.


359 67.8% of Irish Travellers in the Census 2011 did not have qualifications. Irwin, J., McAreeavey, R. and Murphy, N. (2014) The economic and social mobility of ethnic minority communities in Northern Ireland.
Travellers may be partially explained by the lack of qualifications\textsuperscript{360}.

7.18 Cemlyn et al. (2009) posit that the reason many Irish Travellers do not have qualifications is due to ‘leaving school at a young age, and/or illiteracy or cultural resistance to secondary education’\textsuperscript{361}.

7.19 However, even when an Irish Traveller has the requisite qualifications for a job ‘biased attitudes from employers towards Travellers … block and deter Travellers from even applying’\textsuperscript{362}. Therefore, when one barrier has been overcome the other may still exist to a degree, which limits participation in the labour market.

7.20 Michael (2016)\textsuperscript{363} found that the low rate of employment among Irish Travellers is also partially due to a preference for self-employment. This is supported by an Irish study undertaken by Cooney (2009)\textsuperscript{364}. Cooney (2009) found that ‘in the face of discrimination in accessing the waged labour market, many Travellers have turned to self-employment as a solution to achieving an income that will sustain themselves and their families’\textsuperscript{365}.

7.21 Additionally, both Greenfields (2006)\textsuperscript{366} and Cemlyn et al. (2009)\textsuperscript{367} indicate that the little evidence that is available on Irish Travellers and employment, points toward a preference for self-employment. This is particularly prevalent amongst Irish Traveller males. Cemlyn et al. (2009) further state that this self-employment is ‘often associated with working in family groups

and undertaking employment such as gardening, scrapping metal, building and market trading.\textsuperscript{368}

7.22 However, as Cemlyn \textit{et al.} (2009) reports, self-employment has its own barriers.\textsuperscript{369} Cemlyn \textit{et al.} (2010) found Irish Travellers who are self-employed face a barrier in the form of obtaining official permits to work from the site on which they reside. They note that, whilst many site owners turn a blind eye or Irish Travellers may break the rules ‘unofficial arrangements means that individuals who breach tenancy agreements endanger themselves and their families’ security if site owners should choose to enforce the regulations.’\textsuperscript{370}

\begin{shadedbox}
\textbf{Inequality}

Irish Travellers are more likely to be economically inactive than: White; Asian; Black; Mixed; and, Other ethnic groups.
\end{shadedbox}

7.23 The lower employment rate of Irish Travellers is supported by the identification of a higher rate of economic inactivity for Travellers. Irish Travellers were more likely to be economically inactive and less likely to be in employment than: White; Asian; Black; Mixed; and, Other ethnic groups. In addition, female Travellers were more likely to be economically inactive than females from all other ethnic groups.

7.24 Raeside \textit{et al.} (2014) reported that, compared to any other group Irish Travellers have the highest rates of economic inactivity.\textsuperscript{371} The Commission’s analysis of the Census 2011 showed that, at the time of the Census, Irish Travellers had the highest economic inactivity rates of all minority ethnic groups considered.

7.25 Whilst 69.0\% of Irish Travellers were considered economically inactive, only a third (33.9\%) of White and less than a third of:

\begin{footnotesize}


\end{footnotesize}
Asian; Black; Mixed; or, Other\textsuperscript{372} ethnic groups were economically inactive at the time of the Census\textsuperscript{373}.

7.26 The reasons Irish Travellers gave for economic inactivity in order of prominence were: long-term sick or disabled; other; looking after the home or family; being retired; and, being a student\textsuperscript{374, 375}.

7.27 Irwin et al. (2014) identified that for Irish Travellers ‘barriers to labour market participation were also present through lack of networks and unfamiliarity with formal recruitment application processes’\textsuperscript{376}.

7.28 The Commission’s analysis of Census 2011 data found that, when females in each ethnic group were considered, female Irish Travellers had much higher rates of economic inactivity than females from the other ethnic groups considered.

7.29 At the time of the Census 2011, over three quarters (77.9\%) of female Irish Travellers were economically inactive compared to around or just over a third of females in all other ethnic groups\textsuperscript{377}. The gap between rates of economic inactivity for female Irish Travellers and females in other ethnic groups

\textsuperscript{372} At the time of the Census 2011: 27.8\% of Asian; 26.3\% of Black; 29.8\% of Mixed; and, 28.3\% of Other ethnic groups were economically inactive.

\textsuperscript{373} Census Table DC2601NI: Economic Activity by Ethnic Group by Age by Sex.

\textsuperscript{374} 32.1\% were long-term sick or disabled; 27.7\% cited other reasons; 24.2\% cited looking after the home or family; 8.1\% cited being retired; and, 7.9\% cited being a student as the reason for being economically inactive at the time of the Census 2011.

\textsuperscript{375} Census Table DC2601NI: Economic Activity by Ethnic Group by Age by Sex.


\textsuperscript{377} Females in each ethnic group had the following economic inactivity rates: 38.7\% for White; 77.9\% for Irish Travellers; 33.2\% for Asian; 32.2\% for Black; 30.7\% for Mixed; and, 35.6\% for Other ethnic groups.
ranged from 39.2 percentage points to 47.2 percentage points.

7.30 Cooney (2009) cites that a study by Daly (2007)\textsuperscript{380} highlights a cultural barrier faced by Irish Traveller women within their own community where they ‘may be ridiculed for stepping outside of their usual role’\textsuperscript{381}.

7.31 Cemlyn et al. (2009) found that, for Irish Traveller women, ‘family and home [are] at the centre of their value system’\textsuperscript{382}, which might explain why ‘a high percentage of women do not work outside the home, or may work only until they are married and children are born’\textsuperscript{383}. In this community, ‘men [are] primarily responsible for supporting their family financially and practically… and women [for] taking overall responsibility for the home and children’\textsuperscript{384}.

7.32 A cultural barrier was also identified by McQuaid et al. (2013) who reported ‘a cultural resistance to using childcare in Traveller… cultures, which had little tradition of using formal care and/or female employment’\textsuperscript{385}.

\textsuperscript{378} Gaps in economic activity rates between Travellers and other ethnic groups were: 39.2 percentage points for White; 44.7 percentage points for Asian; 45.7 percentage points for Black; 47.2 percentage points for Mixed; and 42.3 percentage points for Other ethnic groups.

\textsuperscript{379} Census Table DC2601NI: Economic Activity by Ethnic Group by Age by Sex.


\textsuperscript{385} McQuaid, R., Graham, H. and Shapira, M (2013) Child Care: Maximising the Participation of Women. Page 54.
Migrant workers, particularly those from Eastern European countries, are subject to industrial and occupational segregation.

7.33 Migrant workers, particularly those from Eastern European countries, are over-represented in lower paid industry sectors and/or in low paid occupations.

7.34 Raeside et al. (2014) noted that, in both 2006 and 2012, the Eastern European workforce experienced industrial segregation. The Commission noted that this had changed little between 2012 and 2016.

7.35 Raeside et al. (2014) looked at data from two time points: 2006 and 2012, whilst the Commission’s LFS analysis, covered each year between 2012 and 2016. Raeside et al. (2014) found that Eastern European workers were mainly employed in the industry sector of ‘Manufacturing’ in both 2006 and 2012.

7.36 The Commission also found that Eastern European workers were mainly employed in one of two industry sectors in each year between 2012 and 2016. In both 2012 and 2015, Eastern European workers were mainly employed in the industry sector of ‘Manufacturing’ in both 2006 and 2012.

---

386 Migrants from A8 and A2 EU countries
388 It should be noted that the Commission only looked at industry sectors which contained over 8,000 Eastern European employees, as found in Labour Force Survey statistics. This ensured that the 8,000 threshold for reporting as set by NISRA was adhered to.
390 Raeside et al. (2014) compared LFS data for industry and occupation sectors for two time points – Q1 2012 and Q1 2016.
392 Migrants from A8 and A2 EU countries
Europeans were mainly employed in the ‘Manufacturing’ industry sector. This changed in 2013 and 2016 to the ‘Distribution, Hotels and Restaurants’ industry sector. In all other industry sectors, between 2012 and 2016 the numbers of Eastern Europeans were too low to report.

The 2011 Census shows that, if employment patterns in Northern Ireland were to be reflective of the population, members of the European Union Accession countries from 2004 onwards would account for only 2.1% of those aged 18 years old or older in Northern Ireland, compared to 95.1% of those from the UK and Ireland.

The Commission found that, in both 2012 and 2015, those from Eastern Europe were overrepresented according to their share of the population in the ‘Manufacturing’ industry sector. This overrepresentation in ‘Manufacturing’ was at a level six to seven times that of their representation within the Northern Ireland population. In addition, in 2013 and 2016, Eastern European workers were overrepresented in the ‘Distribution, Hotels and Restaurants’ industry sector at a level of around three times that of their representation within the Northern Ireland population.

That Eastern European workers are often to be found in ‘lower paying sectors of employment’ is not a new finding. For example, Irwin et al. (2014) found that ‘lower and less skilled sectors of employment, e.g. [the] hospitality sector and

---

393 In Q1 2012 51.0% of Eastern Europeans were employed in the ‘Manufacturing’ industry sector, this decreased to 45.5% in Q1 2015.
394 In Q1 2013 36.6% of Eastern Europeans were employed in the ‘Distribution, Hotels and Restaurants’ industry sector, this decreased to 28.0% in Q1 2015.
395 They did not meet the 8,000 threshold set by NISRA.
396 Whilst the LFS category is ‘Eastern Europe’ for country of birth the most comparable data from the Census 2011 is from EU Accession countries from 2004 onwards. However, this does not only include Eastern European countries but also Cyprus and Malta. Census Table CT0116NI: Country of Birth by Age by Sex.
397 i.e. over 2.1% of jobs in the ‘Manufacturing’ industry sector were undertaken by those from Eastern Europe.
398 In 2012 13.3% of those employed in the ‘Manufacturing’ industry sector were from Eastern Europe, this increased to 15.2% in 2015.
399 In 2013 6.1% of those employed in the ‘Distribution, Hotels and Restaurants’ industry sector were from Eastern Europe, this remained fairly constant at 5.8% in 2016.
meat/food processing, displayed high rates of employment of the Eastern European… communities.\textsuperscript{401}

7.40 In addition, Bell \textit{et al.} (2009) found that migrant worker\textsuperscript{402} respondents to their survey were most commonly employed in the ‘Manufacturing’ industry sector, ‘followed by accommodation and food services activities’\textsuperscript{403, 404}.

7.41 Irwin \textit{et al.} (2014) posited that a possible causal factor for the employment of Eastern European workers in lower paid sectors is that ‘many migrants to Northern Ireland moved in the wake of labour market motability arising from globalisation’ and therefore took up jobs in sectors that needed employees\textsuperscript{405}.

\section*{Inequality}

Migrant workers, particularly those from Eastern European countries are over-represented in some occupations and under-represented in others.

7.42 Raeside \textit{et al.} (2014) noted that, in both 2006 and 2012, the Eastern European workforce experienced occupational segregation\textsuperscript{406}. The Commission noted, from its analysis of LFS data, that this changed little between 2012 and 2016\textsuperscript{407}.

7.43 The Commission found that Eastern European workers were mainly employed in two industry sectors between 2012 and

\textsuperscript{402} The Migrant Worker Strategy defines a migrant worker as ‘someone from outside the UK and Ireland who is here to seek or take up work’. DEL (2008) \textit{A Migrant Workers Strategy for Northern Ireland}. Paragraph number 4.5.
\textsuperscript{403} Bell’s large sample questionnaire was conducted between mid-September 2008 and January 2009. It found that 22\% of migrant worker respondents worked in the ‘Manufacturing’ sector and 16\% in ‘accommodation and food service activities.’
\textsuperscript{405} It should be noted that the Commission only looked at industry sectors which contained over 8,000 Eastern European employees, as found in Labour Force Survey statistics. This ensured that the 8,000 threshold for reporting as set by NISRA was adhered to.
In 2012, Eastern European workers were most often employed in ‘Process, Plant and Machine Operatives’ occupations, this changed to ‘Elementary Occupations’ in 2013. In both 2015 and 2016 Eastern European workers were mainly employed in both ‘Process, Plant and Machine Operatives’ occupations and ‘Elementary Occupations’. In all other occupation sectors, between 2012 and 2016 the numbers of Eastern European represented in the LFS were too low to report upon.

The 2011 Census shows that, if employment patterns in Northern Ireland were to be reflective of the population, members of the European Union Accession countries from 2004 onwards would account for only 2.1% of those aged 18 years old or older in Northern Ireland, compared to 95.1% of those from the UK and Ireland.

The Commission found that, in 2012, 2015 and 2016, those from Eastern Europe were overrepresented according to their share of the population in the ‘Process, Plant and Machine Operatives’ occupation sector. This overrepresentation in ‘Process, Plant and Machine Operatives’ occupations was at a level seven to eight times that of their representation within the Northern Ireland population. In addition, in 2013, 2015 and 2016, Eastern European workers were overrepresented in the ‘Elementary Occupations’ sector at a level of around five to

---

408 It was only in these two occupation sectors that Eastern European workers were consistently represented by over 8,000 in the LFS sample.
409 In 2012 35.7% of Eastern European workers were employed in ‘Process, Plant and Machine Operatives’ occupations.
410 In 2013 40.0% of Eastern European workers were employed in ‘Elementary Occupations’.
411 In 2014, the sample size was too small for each occupation sector i.e. it was below the 8,000 threshold set by NISRA.
412 In 2015 34.8% of Eastern European workers were employed in ‘Process, Plant and Machine Operatives’ occupations, this reduced to 24.6% in 2016.
413 In 2015 28.2% of Eastern European workers were employed in ‘Elementary Occupations’, this increased to 34.7% in 2016.
414 They did not meet the 8,000 threshold set by NISRA.
415 Whilst the LFS category is ‘Eastern Europe’ for country of birth the most comparable data from the Census 2011 is from EU Accession countries from 2004 onwards. However, this does not only include Eastern European countries but also Cyprus and Malta. Census Table CT0116NI: Country of Birth by Age by Sex.
416 i.e. over 2.1% of jobs in the ‘Process, Plant and Machine Operatives’ occupation sector were undertaken by those from Eastern Europe.
417 In 2012 17.7% of those employed in the ‘Process, Plant and Machine Operatives’ occupation sector were from Eastern Europe, this decreased to 15.4% in 2015 and 15.2% in 2016.
seven times that of their representation within the Northern Ireland population\footnote{In 2013 12.3\% of those employed in the ‘Elementary Occupations’ sector were from Eastern Europe, this remained fairly constant at 11.7\% in 2015 and increased to 14.2\% in 2016.}.  

7.46 Bell et al. (2009) found that it was not only Eastern European workers, but migrant workers\footnote{The Migrant Worker Strategy defines a migrant worker as ‘someone from outside the UK and Ireland who is here to seek or take up work’. DEL (2008) \textit{A Migrant Workers Strategy for Northern Ireland}. Paragraph number 4.5.} in general, who were often employed in the ‘Process, Plant and Machine Operatives’ and ‘Elementary Occupation’ sectors\footnote{Bell’s large sample questionnaire was conducted between mid-September 2008 and January 2009. It found that 31\% of migrant worker respondents worked in the ‘Elementary Occupations’ sector and 23\% in the ‘Process, Plant and Machine Operatives’ occupation sector.}.  


\textbf{Key Inequality}  

\textit{Migrant workers are vulnerable to exploitation.}  

7.48 The Commission noted in 2010 that ‘\textit{the recruitment sector plays a considerable role in the recruitment and employment of migrant workers in Northern Ireland\footnote{ECNI (2010) \textit{The Role of the Recruitment Sector in the Employment of Migrant Workers}. Page 4.}. Many migrant workers registered with recruitment agencies may have done so before coming to Northern Ireland; i.e. in their own country.  

7.49 An investigation into the role of the recruitment sector in the employment of migrant workers (ECNI, 2010) found that, often agency workers are: confined to temporary and irregular work; non-guaranteed weekly hours; and being employed under poorer terms and conditions than expected. Further, migrant workers were found to be vulnerable to poor employment
practices despite paying large amounts of money to recruitment agencies in their own country\textsuperscript{425}.

7.50 The investigation also found that agency workers’ were found to ‘experience additional stress through fearing that their work permit will not be renewed by their employer’\textsuperscript{426}. In addition, many were found to have had grievances about holiday and other statutory entitlements and over half of respondents\textsuperscript{427} experienced difficulties with pay (such as errors and delay)\textsuperscript{428}.

7.51 Martynowicz (2014) found that migrant workers’ experience of employment in Northern Ireland is often characterised by the lack of written contracts, the prevalence of ‘casual or “zero-hour” contracts, long working hours, the non-payment of wages, problems in accessing in-work entitlements such as leave\textsuperscript{429}, and attending doctor’s appointments\textsuperscript{430}.

7.52 In a consultation document, the Department for Business Innovation and Skills (2013) cited concerns around the use of exclusivity clauses in ‘zero hour contracts’; as well as a lack of awareness amongst workers about being offered no work or zero hours, and people feeling penalised by their employer if they are not available for work when required\textsuperscript{431}.

7.53 Black Minority Ethnic (BME) parents have also highlighted the ‘short notice period given to work as a particularly frustrating aspect of zero-hours contracts’ and identified that the ‘lack of ability to make suitable childcare arrangements at short notice was a barrier to accepting employment or gaining additional hours’\textsuperscript{432}.

7.54 Allamby \textit{et al.} (2011) also noted that human trafficking is an issue in Northern Ireland\textsuperscript{433}. In their research, Allamby \textit{et al.} (2011) found evidence for six of the ILO’s forms of behaviour

\begin{footnotes}
\item[425] ECNI (2010) \textit{The Role of the Recruitment Sector in the Employment of Migrant Workers.}
\item[427] 60%
\item[428] ECNI (2010) \textit{The Role of the Recruitment Sector in the Employment of Migrant Workers.}
\item[431] Department for Business Innovation and Skills (2013): \textit{Zero Hours Employment Contracts}
\item[432] Barnardos (2014): \textit{Believe in Childcare – the childcare needs of ethnic minority communities.} Page 4 of un-numbered document.
\end{footnotes}
which define ‘forced labour’. They identified that factors which made migrant workers vulnerable to forced labour were: an individual’s legal status, English language proficiency, poor access to advice and information and a lack of support networks.

7.55 Allamby et al. (2011) also report that some migrant workers gain employment in Northern Ireland through gang masters based in their own country; the payment for which usually involves borrowing money that must be paid back no matter what the outcome. Therefore, many migrants who are drawn to Northern Ireland through false promises of employment, such as the type of job advertised or the benefits provided, find that they have no way out of the agreement once they arrive.

7.56 The research by Allamby et al. (2011) also cautions that ‘one common means of forcing people to work was by withholding their personal documents’. Another is to force migrant workers to pay off a debt incurred from ‘borrowing’ money to be furnished with employment in Northern Ireland. This debt is often high and migrant workers are forced to ‘work long and excessive hours to [pay this debt, leaving] … little or no money for themselves’.

7.57 As stated in the Commission’s Statement on Key Inequalities in Housing and Communities in Northern Ireland ‘migrant workers are also vulnerable to becoming subject to tied accommodation’, where ‘work and accommodation are often linked, [therefore,] many cannot leave their job as this

---

440 Accommodation that is provided as a part of a person’s continued employment.
441 ECNI (2017) Statement on Key Inequalities in Housing and Communities in Northern Ireland. Page 32. ECNI: Belfast
would also render them homeless, creating a vicious circle of working long hours and living in poor conditions\textsuperscript{442}.

7.58 Lastly, evidence suggests the exploitation is not linked to nationality, gender or age but instead is ‘associated with the vulnerability of the worker: a lack of English language skills, limited access to social networks, and a lack of local knowledge\textsuperscript{443}.

\textbf{Key Inequality}

**People from minority ethnic groups and migrants workers are at risk of prejudice and discrimination both within and outside the workplace.**

7.59 Many people in Northern Ireland hold prejudicial attitudes towards minority ethnic groups and migrant workers both inside and outside the workplace. In addition, people from minority ethnic groups and migrant workers were found to be at risk of racial prejudice, discrimination and harassment in employment.

7.60 Prejudicial attitudes in Northern Ireland are important because they can lead to a range of negative actions and behaviours including discrimination and harassment. However, it should be noted that while the root cause of discrimination is embedded in prejudicial attitudes\textsuperscript{444}, holding prejudicial attitudes does not necessarily result in discrimination\textsuperscript{445}.

\textbf{Inequality}

**Negative prejudicial attitudes are apparent toward Irish Travellers in Northern Ireland.**

7.61 Raeside \textit{et al.} (2014) identified this inequality through analysis of the 2006 and 2007 Northern Ireland Life and Times Surveys


(NILTS)\textsuperscript{446}. In addition, data from the 2007 and 2015 NILTS was considered by the Commission to ascertain the level of prejudice toward Irish Travellers\textsuperscript{447, 448}.

7.62 The Commission found that, in 2015 compared to 2007, attitudes towards Irish Travellers had somewhat hardened over time\textsuperscript{449, 450}.

7.63 Between 2007 and 2015 the proportion of people who would not willingly accept an Irish Traveller as: a close friend; a relative through marriage; and, a work colleague had increased, indicating a hardening of attitudes. In each scenario around a fifth (20 percentage points) more respondents in 2015 would not willingly accept an Irish Traveller in each of the given scenarios compared to 2007\textsuperscript{451, 452}.

7.64 In 2007, slightly less than half (47\%) of respondents would willingly accept an Irish Traveller as a close friend and this increased by 20-percentage points to 65\% of respondents in 2015. Results were similar for acceptance of an Irish Traveller as a close relative through marriage; in 2007, less than half (47\%) were not accepting, and this had increased by 23-percentage points to 70\% in 2015. Lastly, over half (52\%) of respondents in 2015 would not accept an Irish Traveller as a work colleague, a 23-percentage point increase from 29\% in 2007\textsuperscript{453, 454}.

Data from the 2007 and 2015 NILTS was considered by the Commission to ascertain the level of prejudice toward Eastern Europeans.\textsuperscript{455, 456}

Between 2007 and 2015, acceptance of members of the Eastern European community as a tourist or a resident in the respondents' local area in 2015 had decreased by over a tenth.\textsuperscript{457, 458, 459}

However, between 2007 and 2015, a greater decrease in acceptance was found when respondents to the NILTS were asked to consider if they would willingly accept Eastern Europeans as: a colleague at work; a close friend; or, 'relative by way of marrying a close member of... [their] family'.\textsuperscript{460, 461}

Whilst 71\% of respondents to the 2007 NILTS would willingly accept someone from the Eastern European community as a spouse of a close family member less than half (45\%) held this opinion in 2015; a decrease of 26-percentage points.\textsuperscript{462, 463} Only slightly more respondents to the 2015 NILTS would willingly

\textsuperscript{457} In 2015 86\% of respondents would willingly accept a member of the Eastern European community as a tourist, a decrease of 12 percentage points from 2007 when the proportion was 98\% of respondents. In 2015 70\% of respondents would willingly accept a member of the Eastern European community as a resident in their local area, a decrease of 12 percentage points from 2007 when the proportion was 82\% of respondents.
accept someone from a minority ethnic community as a close friend; this decreased from around three quarters (74%) in 2007 to a half (50%) in 2015\textsuperscript{464, 465, 466}.

7.69 A greater proportion of people were accepting of someone from an Eastern European community as a work colleague than as a close friend or relative by way of marriage. However, acceptance had also decreased considerably in 2015 compared to 2007. Whilst the vast majority (87%) of respondents in 2007 would willingly accept someone from a minority ethnic group as a work colleague, this reduced to less than two thirds (62%) in 2015\textsuperscript{467, 468, 469}.

7.70 The Commission also considered the number and proportion of race hate crimes that were committed against people in Northern Ireland who were from Eastern European countries\textsuperscript{470}. It found that, between 2007/08 and 2015/16, 1,992 crimes were recorded against people from the Eastern European community; this accounted for 34.5% of all crimes with a person victim recorded over the period\textsuperscript{471}.

\textsuperscript{464} In 2015 50% of respondents would willingly accept someone from an Eastern European community as a close friend; this represented a 24 percentage point decrease from 2007 when 74% would willingly accept them as such.


\textsuperscript{467} In 2015 62% of respondents would willingly accept someone from an Eastern European community as a close friend; this represented a 25 percentage point decrease from 2007 when 87% would willingly accept them as such.


\textsuperscript{470} Race hate crimes against the person. Countries recorded in the statistics were: Czech Republic; Hungary; Latvia; Lithuania; Poland; and, Slovakia.

\textsuperscript{471} PSNI (2016) \textit{Racist Incidents and Crimes in Northern Ireland 2004/05 to 2015/16}. Table 2.6 Racist crimes (excluding fraud1) by nationality2 of victim, 2007/08 to 2015/16
Inequality

Prejudicial attitudes toward minority ethnic groups exists in Northern Ireland.

7.71 Data from the 2007 and 2015 NILTS was considered by the Commission to ascertain the level of prejudice toward minority ethnic groups.\(^{472, 473}\)

7.72 Whilst most respondents to the 2015 NILTS indicated that they would not describe themselves as prejudiced against minority ethnic people, over a quarter admitted to being ‘a little prejudiced’.\(^{474, 475}\) The majority of those who indicated that they felt prejudiced against minority ethnic people ‘avoid displaying prejudiced behaviour’, however, over a tenth indicated that their ‘behaviour towards minority ethnic people is consistent with the prejudice… [they] feel’.\(^{476, 477, 478}\)

7.73 In 2007 and 2015, NILTS respondents were asked if they thought there was ‘a lot of prejudice against… [minority ethnic communities] in Northern Ireland nowadays, a little, or hardly any’. Between 2007 and 2015 there was a decrease of over 14 percentage points in the proportion of respondents who felt that there was ‘a lot’ of prejudice against minority ethnic communities in Northern Ireland from 44% in 2007 to 30% in 2015.\(^{479, 480, 481}\)


\(^{474}\) 2% indicated that they were ‘very prejudiced’; 26% that they were ‘a little prejudiced’; and, 69% that they were ‘not prejudiced at all’.


\(^{476}\) 83% indicated that they avoided prejudiced behaviour and 16% indicated that their behaviour was consistent with their prejudice.

\(^{477}\) The question of whether or not respondents were prejudiced was not asked in the 2007 NILTS.


\(^{479}\) Whilst in 2007 44% of respondents felt that ‘there is a lot of prejudice against’ minority ethnic communities this was felt by 30% in 2015; a decrease of 14 percentage points.


Whilst prejudice was perceived to be less in 2015 compared to 2007, an increase in negative attitudes and a lesser acceptance of minority ethnic people was apparent over this period. Between 2007 and 2015 acceptance of minority ethnic communities as a tourist or a resident in the respondents' local area decreased by a tenth.\footnote{In 2015 88% of respondents would willingly accept minority ethnic communities as a tourist, a decrease of 10 percentage points from 2007 when the proportion was 98% of respondents. In 2015 79% of respondents would willingly accept minority ethnic communities as a resident in their local area, a decrease of 10 percentage points from 2007 when the proportion was 89% of respondents.\textsuperscript{482}}\footnote{ARK. Northern Ireland Life and Time Survey, 2007. \textit{Attitudes to Minority Ethnic People}. ARK, June 2008.}\footnote{ARK. Northern Ireland Life and Time Survey, 2015. \textit{Attitudes to Minority Ethnic People}. ARK, June 2016.}\footnote{ARK. Northern Ireland Life and Time Survey, 2007. \textit{Attitudes to Minority Ethnic People}. ARK, June 2008.}\footnote{ARK. Northern Ireland Life and Time Survey, 2015. \textit{Attitudes to Minority Ethnic People}. ARK, June 2016.}\footnote{ARK. Northern Ireland Life and Time Survey, 2007. \textit{Attitudes to Minority Ethnic People}. ARK, June 2008.}\footnote{ARK. Northern Ireland Life and Time Survey, 2015. \textit{Attitudes to Minority Ethnic People}. ARK, June 2016.}\footnote{ARK. Northern Ireland Life and Time Survey, 2007. \textit{Attitudes to Minority Ethnic People}. ARK, June 2008.}\footnote{ARK. Northern Ireland Life and Time Survey, 2015. \textit{Attitudes to Minority Ethnic People}. ARK, June 2016.}

However, between 2015 and 2007, a greater decrease in acceptance was found when respondents to the NILTS were asked to consider if they would willingly accept someone from a minority ethnic community as: a colleague at work; a close friend; or, ‘\textit{relative by way of marrying a close member of… [their] family}’.\footnote{ARK. Northern Ireland Life and Time Survey, 2007. \textit{Attitudes to Minority Ethnic People}. ARK, June 2008.}\footnote{ARK. Northern Ireland Life and Time Survey, 2015. \textit{Attitudes to Minority Ethnic People}. ARK, June 2016.}

Whilst 70% of respondents to the 2007 NILTS would willingly accept someone from a minority ethnic community as a spouse of a close family member less than half (47%) held this opinion in 2015; a decrease of nearly a quarter (23-percentage points).\footnote{ARK. Northern Ireland Life and Time Survey, 2007. \textit{Attitudes to Minority Ethnic People}. ARK, June 2008.}\footnote{ARK. Northern Ireland Life and Time Survey, 2015. \textit{Attitudes to Minority Ethnic People}. ARK, June 2016.} Slightly more respondents to the 2015 NILTS would willingly accept someone from a minority ethnic community as a close friend; however, this decreased by over a quarter (28-percentage points) from 81% in 2007 to a little over half (53%) in 2015.\footnote{ARK. Northern Ireland Life and Time Survey, 2007. \textit{Attitudes to Minority Ethnic People}. ARK, June 2008.}\footnote{ARK. Northern Ireland Life and Time Survey, 2015. \textit{Attitudes to Minority Ethnic People}. ARK, June 2016.}

Acceptance of a minority ethnic person as a work colleague was greater than acceptance of a minority ethnic person as a close friend or relative by way of marriage. However, between 2015 and 2007 acceptance had decreased by a quarter (25

\textit{Attitudes to Minority Ethnic People}. ARK, June 2016.)
percentage points) with 91% of respondents in 2007 willingly to accept someone from a minority ethnic group as a work colleague, compared to two thirds (66%) in 2015.

Rogers and Scullion (2014) found that minority ethnic groups often described fear and intimidation at work, discrimination, a lack of employment rights and poor and sometimes unsafe working conditions.

Many of those who have these negative experiences were either afraid or unable to voice their concerns whether due to fear of losing their job, negative reactions or a lack of English language skills.

In addition, a 2012 Trademark study of employees in a private sector retail organisation reported that 13% (325) of the 2,500 employees had experienced some form of harassment. Of these employees, 23% (75) had experienced racially based harassment.

Moreover, Wood and Wybron (2015) report that ‘prejudice, stereotyping or hidden biases within recruitment processes’ can act as a barrier to employment for migrant workers and minority ethnic people. Their research cites an example of a study conducted by the Department for Work and Pensions in 2009, which found that ‘a CV with a white British name secured an interview in every nine applications, compared with one in every 16 applications for more obviously ethnic minority names’.

---

Inequalities and Differences

Migrant workers face multiple barriers to employment in Northern Ireland.

7.82 Irwin et al. (2014) report that barriers to participation in the labour market include ‘a lack of networks and unfamiliarity with formal recruitment application processes’. Rogers and Scullion (2014) also note that formal recruitment processes are a barrier to participation.

7.83 Irwin et al. (2014) report that migrant workers may also be faced with a lack of recognition for overseas qualifications. A consequence of this is that migrant workers ‘are more likely to have qualifications far beyond those required for their job’.

7.84 A ‘failure of employers to recognise the qualifications, skills, knowledge and experience of migrant workers and the potential they have to offer in the workplace’ has also been cited by Rogers and Scullion (2014) who believe that this further contributes to a ‘glass-ceiling’ for migrant workers who are in senior positions.

7.85 Another barrier to employer is proficiency in the English language. Irwin et al. (2014) reported that migrant workers

---

502 The Migrant Worker Strategy defines a migrant worker as ‘someone from outside the UK and Ireland who is here to seek or take up work’. DEL (2008) *A Migrant Workers Strategy for Northern Ireland*, Paragraph number 4.5.
506 The Migrant Worker Strategy defines a migrant worker as ‘someone from outside the UK and Ireland who is here to seek or take up work’. DEL (2008) *A Migrant Workers Strategy for Northern Ireland*, Paragraph number 4.5.
experience barriers to employment due to insufficient language proficiency.\footnote{Irwin, J., McAreavey, R. and Murphy, N. (2014) \textit{The economic and social mobility of ethnic minority communities in Northern Ireland.}}

7.86 Wood and Wybron (2015) also reported that language and cultural barriers exist in not only finding work but also in integrating into a workplace.\footnote{Wood, C. and Wybron, I. (2015) \textit{Entry to, and progression in, work.}} Rogers and Scullion (2014) warn that, in Northern Ireland, `there is an urgent need to address the dearth and quality of affordable and accessible English language tuition'.\footnote{Rogers, S. and Scullion, G. (2014) \textit{Voices for Change. Mapping the views of black and minority ethnic people on integration and their sense of belonging in Northern Ireland.} Page 39.}

7.87 Language can also act as barrier to migrant workers accessing childcare. For example, McQuaid et al. (2013) reported the language barrier as a key issue for migrants and minority ethnic families in `accessing childcare that is compatible with working atypical hours; [migrant and minority ethnic families]… are quite likely to be either low-paid shift workers, or healthcare workers with long and erratic hours'.\footnote{McQuaid, R., Graham, H. and Shapira, M (2013) \textit{Child Care: Maximising the Participation of Women.} Page 54.}

7.88 Research has also identified access to childcare is an additional barrier to employment for migrant workers. For example, Rogers and Scullion (2014) reported that accessible and affordable childcare `that fits with the reality of workers’ atypical and shift work patterns’ is lacking in Northern Ireland.\footnote{Rogers, S. and Scullion, G. (2014) \textit{Voices for Change. Mapping the views of black and minority ethnic people on integration and their sense of belonging in Northern Ireland.} Page 39.}

7.89 With regard to rates of unemployment, the Commission’s analysis of the Census 2011 showed that, at the time of the Census, those from a Black ethnic group had the highest unemployment rates of all minority ethnic groups considered.

\begin{center}
\begin{tcolorbox}[coltitle=blue, colback=blue!10!white, title=Inequality]
People from a Black ethnic group are more likely to be unemployed than: White; Irish Travellers; Asian; Mixed; and, Other ethnic groups.
\end{tcolorbox}
\end{center}
The data showed that 12% of those from a Black minority ethnic group were unemployed compared to less than a tenth of all other minority ethnic groups\textsuperscript{512, 513}.

\textsuperscript{512} 12.4% of those from a Black ethnic group were unemployed compared to: 5.0% of White; 7.7% of Irish Travellers; 3.8% of Asian; 6.8% of Mixed; and, 7.3% of Other ethnic groups.

\textsuperscript{513} Census Table DC2601NI: Economic Activity by Ethnic Group by Age by Sex.
8 Religious Belief and Political Opinion

Religious Belief

8.1 In Northern Ireland, fair employment legislation\(^{514}\) requires that employers\(^{515}\) monitor the community background\(^{516}\) of employees, specifically those who are from a Protestant and Catholic background.

8.2 According to the Fair Employment Monitoring report No. 26\(^{517}\), Protestants comprise 52.5% of the monitored workforce; while Catholics comprise 47.9% of the monitored workforce and this now more closely mirrors the composition of all those available for work.

8.3 The Census 2011 identified that among the working age population from 16-64 years, 46.3% were from a Protestant community background, 45.5% were from a Catholic community background, 1.0% were from an ‘Other’ religion and 5.2% had no religious background. Considering those from a Protestant and Catholic background only, 50.5% were from a Protestant background and 49.5% were from a Catholic background.

8.4 When current religious beliefs were considered, the Census 2011 identified that among the working age population from 16-64 years in Northern Ireland, 41.5% stated that their religion is Catholic, 39.5% stated that their religion was Protestant or ‘other Christian’, 0.9% stated that they belonged to an ‘Other’ religion; while 11.4% said they had no religion. A further 6.7% of the population refused to state their religion.


\(^{515}\) Employers with more than 11 employees. For more details see: http://www.equalityni.org/Employers-Service-Providers/Large-Business/Registration-and-monitoring/Fair-Employment-Code-of-Practice

\(^{516}\) Religion or religion brought up in

This chapter will seek to identify employment inequalities in relation to religious belief. However, due to low sample size in the Labour Force Survey (LFS) for those of ‘Other religion’ and ‘No religion’ it will not be possible to comment on the current employment situation of these groups. For this reason, this draft Statement will concentrate on LFS data for those who are Catholic and Protestant, supplementing with other data sources for those of ‘Other religion’ and ‘No religion’ where available.

**Political Opinion**

Whilst Section 75 determines political opinion as a separate equality ground to religious belief there is an absence of literature or data in this area with regard to employment. Raeside et al. (2014) caution that ‘there is often a conceptual and analytical overlap between political orientation, religious identity and ethnicity’. For example, in Northern Ireland ‘the term “sectarian harassment” is commonly used… to refer to harassment on the ground of religious belief or political opinion’. In addition, the Fair Employment and Treatment Order (Northern Ireland) 1998, makes it unlawful to discriminate on the grounds of religious belief and political opinion.

Raeside et al.’s (2014) study of Employment Inequalities in Northern Ireland noted that Labour Force Statistics data does not include political opinion as a variable. Therefore, no analysis of LFS data was possible with regard to political opinion and employment.

However, Raeside et al. (2014) and the Commission were able to analyse Northern Ireland Life and Times Survey (NILTS) data which included a variable on political opinion and

---

523 Analysis conducted on 2013-2015 data.
also provided some information on the employment characteristics of its respondents\textsuperscript{524}.

8.9 The Commission found that, in 2013\textsuperscript{525}, 2014\textsuperscript{526} and, 2015\textsuperscript{527}, the majority of NILTS respondents (around two fifths) considered themselves as Neither Unionist nor Nationalist\textsuperscript{528}. In addition, a greater proportion of respondents considered themselves Unionist than Nationalist. For example, in 2013 over 29% of respondents said they were Unionist and this increased to around a third in 2014 and 2015 (32.2% and 33.5% respectively). In all three years around a quarter of respondents considered themselves Nationalist\textsuperscript{529}.

8.10 For ease of reference, this text below uses the following names for the three political opinion groups: Nationalist, Unionist and ‘Neither’.

\textbf{Summary}

8.11 Negative attitudes toward those of different religious belief are present in Northern Ireland, particularly sectarianism and islamophobia. \textbf{Prejudicial attitudes and/or discrimination on the grounds of religious belief is present both within and outside the workplace.} Prejudicial attitudes, harassment and, intimidation can create a climate of fear which can impact on a person’s ability to \textit{sustain employment}, particularly where individuals are reluctant to speak out due to fears of further victimisation.

\textsuperscript{524} Caution should be applied here as the NILTS is not as comprehensive a dataset as the LFS, therefore, a detailed analysis was not possible.
\textsuperscript{525} ARK. Northern Ireland Life and Times Survey, 2013 [computer file]. ARK www.ark.ac.uk/nilt [distributor], June 2014.
\textsuperscript{527} ARK. Northern Ireland Life and Times Survey, 2015 [computer file]. ARK www.ark.ac.uk/nilt [distributor], June 2016
\textsuperscript{528} In 2013 43.2% of respondents to the NILTS considered themselves to be neither Unionist nor Nationalist. This decreased in 2014 to 40.3% and in 2015 to 39.4%.
\textsuperscript{529} In 2013 24.9% of respondents to the NILTS considered themselves Nationalist. This was compared to 25.2% in 2014 and 24.5% in 2015.
Key Inequalities

Key Inequality

Prejudicial attitudes and/or discrimination on the grounds of religious belief is present both within and outside the workplace.

8.12 Prejudice and discrimination on the grounds of religious belief, is still present in Northern Ireland, particularly in relation to sectarianism and islamophobia.

8.13 As noted in the last section, prejudicial attitudes in Northern Ireland are important because they can lead to a range of negative actions and behaviours including discrimination and harassment. However, it should be noted that while the root cause of discrimination is embedded in prejudicial attitudes, holding prejudicial attitudes does not necessarily result in discrimination.

Inequality

Sectarianism is still present in the workplace in Northern Ireland.

8.14 A 2012 study of employees in a private sector retail organisation reported that 13% (325) of the 2500 employees had experienced some form of harassment. Of those employees who experienced some form of harassment, 44% (n=143) had experienced sectarian harassment.

8.15 This study reported ‘that low level but persistent sectarian harassment is a feature of too many workplaces in Northern Ireland’. It also found that whilst employees felt threatened, they were reluctant to speak up about the harassment they experienced.

---

received believing it was 'hard to prove and held the potential for further victimisation'\(^{534}\).

8.16 In addition, respondents cited that the situation was negatively affected ‘where management do not just collude but support and encourage, [where] it is entirely acceptable to isolate, exclude and harass minority workers’\(^{535}\).

8.17 A further possible barrier to tackling sectarianism in the workplace is the attitude of ‘some employers and trade unionists [who] complained that there is little they can do about what goes on outside the place of work and that the culture can be so strong in the area that their ability to set a different culture within the workplace is limited’\(^{536}\).

8.18 The Northern Ireland Life and Times Survey (NILTS) asked respondents to state whether they preferred a workplace with people of only their own religion. In 2015, a small proportion of just over a tenth (11%) of respondents said they would prefer to work in a workplace of their ‘own religion only’. However, this proportion had more than doubled over the period from 5% in 2007 to 11% in 2015, whilst the proportion of those who would prefer a ‘mixed religion workplace’ decreased\(^{537}\).

8.19 Most respondents to the NILTS indicated that, between 2007 and 2010\(^{538}\) workplaces were a ‘neutral space’ ‘always or most of the time’\(^{539}\). Few respondents indicated that their workplace was ‘never’ a ‘neutral space’\(^{540}\).


\(^{537}\) In 2007 5% of respondents would prefer an ‘own religion only workplace’ and 93% a ‘mixed religion workplace, respectively; in 2008 the percentages were 5% and 92%, respectively; in 2009 the percentages were 6% and 92%, respectively; in 2012 the percentages were 12% and 80%, respectively; in 2013 the percentages were 14% and 78%, respectively; in 2014 the percentages were 16% and 80%, respectively; and, in 2015 the percentages were 11% and 84%, respectively.

\(^{538}\) The question was not asked in the 2012 to 2015 surveys.

\(^{539}\) In 2007 88% believed their workplace to ‘always’ be a ‘neutral space’; this remained relatively stable in 2008 at 88%, 89% in 2009, and 86% in 2010.

\(^{540}\) In 2007 5% believed their workplace to ‘never’ be a ‘neutral space’; this remained relatively stable in 2008 at 3%, 4% in 2009, and 5% in 2010.
The ability to express cultural identity in the workplace was something most respondents to the NILT surveys either felt able to ‘definitely’ or ‘probably’ do.

Whilst most respondents to the NILT surveys would prefer ‘much more’ or a ‘bit more mixing’ in the workplace, over a tenth would like to ‘keep things as they are’. However, respondents were not asked what things were currently like in their workplace. Therefore, those who answered ‘keep things as they are’ may work in a mixed or a non-mixed workplace.

Data from the 2007 and 2015 NILTS was considered by the Commission to ascertain the level of prejudice toward Muslims. Analysis of the results revealed that attitudes toward Muslims are particularly negative in Northern Ireland.

In 2015, around a third of respondents (31%) would not accept a Muslim as a tourist while nearly a half (45%) would not accept a Muslim as a resident in the respondents’ local area. Between 2007 and 2015, negative attitudes toward members of the Muslim community as tourists had more than doubled (an 18-percentage point increase) from 13% in 2007, while negative attitudes towards Muslims as residents in the

---

541 In 2007 43% felt able to ‘definitely’ express their cultural identity in the workplace and 15% ‘probably’; the percentages for each increased in the years 2008 – 61% and 24%, respectively; 62% and 25% in 2009, respectively; 62% and 24%, respectively. The proportion citing ‘definitely’ decreased in 2015 to 47%, however, there was a subsequent increase in those answering ‘probably’ (36%) in the same year. The question was not asked in the 2012 to 2014 surveys.


respondents’ local area had increased by 13-percentage points from 32% in 2007\textsuperscript{545, 546}.

8.24 However, in 2015, around half or the majority of respondents held negative attitudes toward a Muslim as a colleague at work (50%); a close friend (60%); or, a close relative by marriage (68%)\textsuperscript{547}. Between 2007 and 2015 the proportion of respondents to the NILTS who were not willing to accept a Muslim as: a colleague at work; a close friend; or, a close relative by marriage had increased substantially\textsuperscript{548, 549}.

8.25 In 2007, respondents who would not accept a Muslim as a close friend were in the minority; however, by 2015 they were in the majority. Between 2007 and 2015, the proportion of people not willing to accept a Muslim as a close friend had increased by 22-percentage points from 38% in 2007\textsuperscript{550, 551}. In addition, the proportion of respondents not willing to accept a Muslim as a close relative by marriage had increased substantially by 17-percentage points from 51% in 2007\textsuperscript{552, 553}.

8.26 A greater proportion of people were willing to accept a Muslim as a work colleague than as a close friend or relative by way of marriage. However, between 2007 and 2015 the proportion of people not willing to accept a Muslim as a work colleague as a

work colleague had almost doubled (an increase of 23-percentage points) from 27% in 2007\textsuperscript{554, 555}.

8.27 There is little evidence of the experience of Muslims within or outside the workplace in Northern Ireland. However, research from Great Britain has indicated that, relative to other religions, ‘Muslims report and experience discrimination of a greater frequency and seriousness than other religious groups’\textsuperscript{556}, particularly in the wake of terror bombings which has had an impact on public perceptions of Muslims\textsuperscript{557}. In particular, research in Great Britain\textsuperscript{558} and Ireland\textsuperscript{559} has documented prejudicial attitudes and behaviour including harassment and abuse directed toward Muslims, particularly female Muslims who wear the hijab or niqab and are therefore, visibly Muslim.

\textit{Inequalities and Differences – Religious Belief}

8.28 A number of differences in employment on the grounds of religious belief where identified in this section. Further evidence is required to establish whether these differences are inequalities.

\textbf{Difference}

Catholics aged 18-24 years old have higher rates of economic inactivity than Protestants aged 18-24 years old.

8.29 Analysis of LFS data by religion and age by Raeside et al. (2014)\textsuperscript{560} and the Commission found that, between 2014 and

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\bibitem{554} ARK. Northern Ireland Life and Time Survey, 2007. \url{Attitudes to Minority Ethnic People}. ARK, June 2008.
\bibitem{555} ARK. Northern Ireland Life and Time Survey, 2015. \url{Attitudes to Minority Ethnic People}. ARK, June 2016.
\bibitem{558} Allen C, Isakjee A and ogtem Young o (2013) "maybe we are hated": The experience and impact of anti-Muslim hate on British Muslim women. University of Birmingham: Birmingham.
\end{thebibliography}
2016, Catholics aged 18-24 years old showing higher rates of economic inactivity than Protestants aged 18-24 years old\(^{561}\).

### Difference

Catholics aged 18-24 years old have lower employment rates than Protestants aged 18-24 years old.

#### 8.30 Analysis of LFS data by religion and age by the Commission found that, between 2013 and 2016, Catholics aged 18-24 years old experienced lower rates of employment than Protestants aged 18-24 years old, with a gap of 9.6 percentage points in 2016\(^{562}\).

### Difference

Protestant females are more likely to work part-time than Catholic females.

#### 8.31 Between 2006 and 2012, Raeside et al. (2014) found ‘little difference in part-time employment rates between Catholics and Protestants’\(^{563}\). The Commission’s analysis of LFS data by gender and religion found that, between 2013 and 2015, Protestant females had higher rates of part-time employment than Catholic females\(^{564}\).

---

\(^{561}\) In Q1 2014 41.4% of Catholics aged 18-24 years old were economically inactive compared to 31.0% of Protestants aged 18-24 years old; a gap of 10.1 percentage points. In Q1 2015 42.5% of Catholics aged 18-24 years old were economically inactive compared to 29.0% of Protestants aged 18-24 years old; a gap of 13.5 percentage points. In Q1 2016 33.3% of Catholics aged 18-24 years old were economically inactive compared to 22.2% of Protestants aged 18-24 years old; a gap of 11.1 percentage points.

\(^{562}\) The Q1 2013 employment rates were: 45.7% for Catholics aged 18-24 years old and 50.5% for Protestants aged 18-24 years old. The Q1 2014 employment rates were: 43.4% for Catholics aged 18-24 years old and 59.4% for Protestants aged 18-24 years old. The Q1 2015 employment rates were: 44.6% for Catholics aged 18-24 years old and 54.0% for Protestants aged 18-24 years old. The Q1 2016 employment rates were: 53.5% for Catholics aged 18-24 years old and 63.1% for Protestants aged 18-24 years old.


\(^{564}\) In Q1 2013 42.3% of Protestant females were employed part-time compared to 38.2% of Catholic females; a difference of 4.1 percentage points. In Q1 2014 42.7% of Protestant females were employed part-time compared to 35.3% of Catholic females; a difference of 7.4 percentage points. In Q1 2015 40.5% of Protestant females were employed part-time compared to 33.2% of Catholic females; a difference of 7.3 percentage points. In Q1 2016 43.3% of Protestant females were employed part-time compared to 38.3% of Catholic females; a difference of 5.0 percentage points.
8.32 Analysis of LFS data by religion and age by the Commission found that, between 2012 and 2016, Catholics aged 50-64 years old were less likely to work in the private sector than Protestants aged 50-64 years old, with a gap greater than 10-percentage points in almost every year between 2012 and 2016. 

8.33 Raeside et al.’s (2014) analysis of LFS data found that, in 2012, Protestants were over-represented (according to their share of the employed population) in six of the nine industry sectors considered.

8.34 The Commission analysis of industry sector LFS data found that, between 2014 and 2016, Protestants were consistently under-represented in the ‘Construction’ sector, with Protestant employees in Q1 2016, representing 35.9% of the share of Catholics aged 50-64 years old are less likely to work in the private sector than Protestants aged 50-64 years old.

Protestants are under-represented, compared to Catholics in the ‘Construction’ industry sector.

---

565 Except for in 2013 when only a 1.1 percentage point gap was found
566 In Q1 2012 56.0% of Catholics aged 50-64 years old were employed in the private sector compared to 70.8% of Protestants aged 50-64 years old; a gap of 14.8 percentage points. In Q1 2013 66.1% of Catholics aged 50-64 years old were employed in the private sector compared to 67.2% of Protestants aged 50-64 years old; a gap of 1.1 percentage points. In Q1 2014 59.4% of Catholics aged 50-64 years old were employed in the private sector compared to 67.1% of Protestants aged 50-64 years old; a gap of 7.7 percentage points. In Q1 2015 59.3% of Catholics aged 50-64 years old were employed in the private sector compared to 70.6% of Protestants aged 50-64 years old; a gap of 11.3 percentage points. In Q1 2016 58.0% of Catholics aged 50-64 years old were employed in the private sector compared to 70.1% of Protestants aged 50-64 years old; a gap of 12.1 percentage points.
567 In all sectors but: ‘Manufacturing’; ‘Construction’; and, ‘Public Administration, Education and Health’.
568 This was possible in all but two industry sectors: ‘Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing’ and ‘Energy and Water’.
‘Construction’ jobs less than their share of the population (50.5% according to Census 2011).

**Inequalities and Differences – Political Opinion**

8.35 A number of differences in employment on the grounds of political opinion where identified in this section. Further evidence is required to establish whether these differences are inequalities.

**Difference**

Nationalists are more likely to be economically inactive than those who are Unionist and those who are neither Nationalist nor Unionist.

8.36 Raeside *et al.* (2014), through their analysis of 2006 and 2012 NILTS data, found that those who identified as Nationalist were more likely to be economically inactive than either those who identified as Unionist or those who identified as ‘Neither’.

8.37 The Commission’s analysis of NILTS data over the period 2013 to 2015 found that, both those who identified as Unionist and Nationalist had higher rates of economic inactivity than those who identified as ‘Neither’.

---

569 In Q1 2014 the ‘Construction’ workforce was made up of 36.4% Protestants and 63.6% Catholics. In Q1 2015 the ‘Construction’ workforce was made up of 39.4% Protestants and 60.6% Catholics. In Q1 2016 the ‘Construction’ workforce was made up of 35.9% Protestants and 64.1% Catholics.

570 49.5% Catholics compared to 50.5% Protestants.


572 In 2013, 30.5% of those who identified themselves as ‘Neither’ were economically inactive compared to 41.6% of those who identified themselves as Unionist and 34.5% of those who identified themselves as Nationalist. In 2014, 41.7% of those who identified themselves as Unionist and 41.1% of those who identified themselves as Nationalist were economically inactive. In 2015, 50.9% of those who identified themselves as Unionist and 49.8% of those who identified themselves as Nationalist were economically inactive.
Whilst Raeside *et al.*’s (2014)\(^{573}\) analysis of 2006 and 2012 NILTS data found that those who identified as Nationalist had the lowest employment rates the Commission did not find this to be the case in 2013 to 2015.

The Commission’s analysis of NILTS data over the period 2013 to 2015 found that, both those who identified as Unionists and those who identified as Nationalists were less likely to be in employment compared to those who identified as ‘Neither’\(^{574}\).

---


\(^{574}\) In 2013, the gap between those who identified as ‘Neither’ (57.5%) and those who identified as Nationalist (52.2%) or Unionist (48.0%) was 5.3 percentage points and 9.5 percentage points respectively. In 2014 56.6% of those who identified themselves as ‘Neither’ were in employment compared to 49.1% of those who identified themselves as Unionist (a 7.5 percentage point gap) and 48.1% of those who identified themselves as Nationalist (a 8.5 percentage point gap). In 2015 58.5% of those who identified themselves as ‘Neither’ were in employment compared to 47.6% of those who identified themselves as Unionist (a 10.9 percentage point gap) and 47.8% of those who identified themselves as Nationalist (a 10.7 percentage point gap).
9 Age

9.1 This chapter considered age-related employment in those of working age only. While those who are 16-17 years old are of working age, the majority (85.8%) of this age group\textsuperscript{575} are economically inactive and do not participate in employment, either because they are students or are undertaking government training\textsuperscript{576}.

9.2 Due to changes in legislation\textsuperscript{577} there is no longer a compulsory retirement age. Therefore, people over 65 years could also be considered to be of working age. However, this chapter will only consider those between 18-64 years, in line with the LFS definition of working age\textsuperscript{578}.

Summary

9.3 Younger people experience age-related inequalities in relation to participation in employment. Those aged 18-24 years old have higher unemployment rates than those aged 25 years and older. Youth employment has been previously identified as a key inequality in our previous 2007 Statement on Key Inequalities. Youth unemployment is associated with lifelong problems, such as worklessness, poverty, limited employment opportunities, low wages, lower average life satisfaction and ill health.

\textsuperscript{575} The rates of economic inactivity between Q1 2012 and Q1 2016 were: 86.3\% in Q1 2012; 87.4\% in Q1 2013; 79.3\% in Q1 2014; 86.1\% in Q1 2015; and, 86.5\% in Q1 2016.

\textsuperscript{576} LFS data showed that, in Q1 2012, 96.8\% of those who were economically inactive were so due to being a student. In Q1 2016, 94.7\% of those who were economically inactive were so due to being a student.


\textsuperscript{578} See: https://www.nisra.gov.uk/statistics/labour-market-and-social-welfare/labour-force-survey
Key Inequalities

9.4 Analysis of LFS data carried out by Raeside et al. (2014)\textsuperscript{579} found that at nearly all time points\textsuperscript{580} between 2006 and 2012, those aged 18-24 years old had the highest rates of ILO unemployment compared to those aged 25 years old and older.

9.5 The Commission’s analysis of LFS data found that, between 2012 and 2016, those aged 18-24 years old evidenced higher rates of ILO unemployment than both those aged 25-49 years old and those aged 50-64 years old, respectively\textsuperscript{581, 582, 583}.

9.6 Between 2012 and 2016, the gap in ILO unemployment rates between those aged 18-24 years old and those aged 25-49 years old increased by 3.2 percentage points\textsuperscript{584}. Likewise, between 2012 and 2016, the gap in ILO unemployment rates between those aged 18-24 years old and those aged 50-64 years old also increased to a lesser degree by 2.3 percentage points\textsuperscript{585}.

9.7 However, at most time points between 2012 and 2016, the largest gap in unemployment rates was between those aged 18-24 years old and those aged 25-49 years old.

9.8 The employment of young people was previously identified as one of the key areas in our 2007 Statement on Key

\textsuperscript{580} Except for Q1 and Q3 2006.
\textsuperscript{581} The ILO unemployment rates for those aged 18-24 years old were: 10.2% in Q1 2012; 12.9% in Q1 2013; 11.8% in Q1 2014; 13.7% in Q1 2015; and, 12.4% in Q1 2016.
\textsuperscript{582} The ILO unemployment rates for those aged 25-49 years old were: 4.8% in Q1 2012; 5.3% in Q1 2013; 4.8% in Q1 2014; 3.2% in Q1 2015; and, 3.8% in Q1 2016.
\textsuperscript{583} The ILO unemployment rates for those aged 50-64 years old were: 2.9% in Q1 2012; 3.9% in Q1 2013; 2.8% in Q1 2014; 3.3% in Q1 2015; and, 2.8% in Q1 2016.
\textsuperscript{584} In Q1 2012 the gap between those aged 18-24 years old and those aged 25-49 years old was 5.4 percentage points compared to 8.6 percentage points in Q1 2016.
\textsuperscript{585} In Q1 2012 the gap between those aged 18-24 years old and those aged 50-64 years old was 7.3 percentage points compared to 9.6 percentage points in Q1 2016.
Inequalities\textsuperscript{586}. Subsequent research\textsuperscript{587} published by the Commission in 2010 identified not being in education, employment or training as a key area of inequality for the 18-24 year old age group. Therefore, this is a persistent inequality.

9.9 Research\textsuperscript{588} has shown that spending time not in education, employment or training (NEET) is linked to lifelong problems associated with worklessness, poverty, limited employment opportunities, poor pay and ill health. People who are unemployed in their youth also have lower average life satisfaction and lower wages, with unemployment more likely to leave a long-term scar for young people compared to other adult age groups\textsuperscript{589}.

\textbf{Inequalities and Differences}

9.10 Some evidence of inequalities relating to barriers to employment were evident for both younger and older people, particularly in relation to attitudes to younger people.

9.11 In addition, a number of differences in employment on the grounds of age where identified in this section. Further evidence is required to establish whether these differences are inequalities due to barriers to employment.

9.12 It should be noted that younger people between 18-24 years may be students (in third level or further education) and/or on government training schemes and therefore, may be less likely to be classed as in employment and more likely to be classed as economically inactive. In addition, those aged 50-64 years have the opportunity to retire early and this may also impact on the proportion of those classed in employment or economically inactive.

\textsuperscript{586} ECNI (2007) Statement on Key Inequalities in Northern Ireland. ECNI: Belfast
\textsuperscript{588} Bell and Blanchflower, quoted in McQuaid R, Hollywood, E, Canduela J (2010). Employment Inequalities in an Economic Downturn. ECNI: Belfast
\textsuperscript{589} Bell and Blanchflower, quoted in McQuaid R, Hollywood, E, Canduela J (2010). Employment Inequalities in an Economic Downturn. ECNI: Belfast
9.13 The Commission’s research on age-related issues and attitudes (2008) found that respondents felt the main work-related issues affecting younger people in Northern Ireland at the time of the survey were: ‘getting a job’; ‘meeting the essential criteria when applying for a job’; ‘national minimum wage rates’; and, ‘job insecurity’.590

9.14 In contrast, for those considered to be older workers, the main work-related issues were viewed to be: ‘difficulty in getting a job’; ‘being made redundant’; and, ‘job insecurity’.591, 592

9.15 In addition, research has indicated that young people perceive that they are more likely to be subject to negative attitudes in employment compared to older people. A tenth (10.0%) of respondents to the Commission’s age-related issues and attitudes research (2008) believed that they were treated ‘worse than older people… because of their age’, with this belief more likely to held by younger people from 16-29 years old. In comparison, only 4.3% of respondents believed that younger people were treated better ‘than older people… because of their age’.593

590 The research identified that the average age respondents felt to represent the ‘younger’ age group was 17 to 27 years old.
591 The respective percentages were: 54.4% ‘getting a job’; 35.2% ‘meeting the essential criteria when applying for a job’; 25.1% ‘national minimum wage rates’; and, 10.6% ‘job insecurity’
593 The research identified that the average age respondents felt to represent the ‘older’ age group was 46 to 67 years old.
594 The respective percentages were: 46.9% ‘difficulty in getting a job’; 24.0% ‘being made redundant’; and, 18.5% ‘job insecurity’
596 19.2% of those aged 16-29 years old believed younger people were treated worse compared to 15.1% of those aged 30-44 years old and 11.3% of those aged 45-64 years old.
9.16 The Commission’s research on age-related issues and attitudes (2008) also found that, when given a scenario on who should be sent on a management-training course, 12.4% of respondents felt that an older man should be sent rather than a younger man. The main reasons behind this decision were that an older man has ‘more experience’ and is ‘more mature, responsible and loyal’\(^{598, 599}\).

\textbf{Difference}

Those aged 18-24 years old have lower employment rates than those aged 25 years and older.

9.17 Raeside \textit{et al.}’s (2014) analysis of LFS data showed that the employment rates for those aged 18-24 years old were consistently lower than those aged 25-49 years old between 2006 and 2012\(^{600}\). In addition, between 2009 and 2016, there was an emergent gap in employment rates, with the employment rate lower for those aged 18-24 years old than those aged 50-64 year olds\(^{601, 602}\).

9.18 Similarly, the Commission’s analysis of LFS data between 2012 and 2016 found that, those aged 18-24 years old had lower rates of employment than those aged 25-49 years old and 50-64 years old\(^{603}\). Between 2012 and 2016 there was a narrowing

\(^{598}\) 69.1% of respondents who would send the older man on a course rather than a younger man felt that the older man would have ‘more experience’, an additional 22.0% felt that an older man was ‘more mature, responsible and loyal’.

\(^{599}\) Equality Commission for Northern Ireland (2008) \textit{Awareness of the age regulations and attitudes of the general public in Northern Ireland towards age-related issues}.


\(^{602}\) The Commission could not discern the actual proportions from Raeside \textit{et al.}’s (2014) research. However, a gap beginning in Q1 2009 is clearly visible in the graphical representations provided on page 52 of the research report.

\(^{603}\) Between Q1, 2012-Q1, 2016 the employment rate for 18-24 years olds was in the range 46.6%-59.0%, the range for 25-49 year olds was 77.9%-81.1% and the range for 50-64 year olds was 60.5%-64.3%.
of the employment gap between those aged 18-24 years old and those aged 25-49 years old and 50-64 years old.  

Difference

Both those aged 18-24 years old and those aged 50-64 years old are more likely to be economically inactive than those aged 25-49 years old.

9.19 Raeside et al (2014) found that, at each time point, between 2006 and 2012, those aged 25-49 years old experienced lower rates of economic inactivity than those aged either 18-24 years old or those aged 50-64 years old.

9.20 Similarly, the Commission’s analysis of LFS data over the period 2012 to 2016, found that both those aged 18-24 years old and those aged 50-64 years old experienced rates of economic inactivity that were higher than the rates experienced by 25-49 year olds.

9.21 There is insufficient evidence that higher rates of economic activity arise from barriers to employment and therefore constitute an inequality. It should be noted that younger people between 18-24 years old may be students (in third level or further education) and/or on government training schemes and therefore, may be less likely to be classed as in employment and more likely to be classed as economically inactive, as noted below.

---

604 The gap in the employment rates of those aged 18-24 years old compared to those aged 25-49 years old was 34.5 percentage points in Q1 2012 compared to 20.5 percentage points in Q1 2016.

605 The gap in the employment rates of those aged 18-24 years old compared to those aged 50-64 years old was 14.3 percentage points in Q1 2012 compared to 5.0 percentage points in Q1 2016.


607 The economic inactivity rate for those aged 18-24 years old was 43.2% in Q1 2012 and 28.6% in Q1 2016. The economic inactivity rate for those aged 50-64 years old was 36.2% in Q1 2012 and 33.2% in Q1 2016. The economic inactivity rate for those aged 25-49 years old was 14.1% in Q1 2012 and 16.7% in Q1 2016.

608 Raeside et al.’s (2014) analysis considered data from Q1 2006 to Q1 2012; the Commission’s considered data between Q1 2012 and Q1 2016.
Raeside et al. (2014)\textsuperscript{609,610} and the Commission\textsuperscript{611} found that, between 2006 and 2016, those aged 50-64 years old had lower rates of employment than those aged 25-49 years old\textsuperscript{612}. In Quarter one 2016, 64.0\% of those aged 50-64 years old were in employment compared to 79.5\% of 25-49 year olds, an employment gap of 15.5 percentage points.

Between 2012 and 2016, the rate of employment for those aged 25-49 years old decreased slightly by 1.6 percentage points whereas that of those aged 50-64 years old increased slightly by 3.1 percentage points\textsuperscript{613}. However, the employment gap persisted throughout this period\textsuperscript{614}.

The Commission's analysis of LFS data showed that, between 2012 and 2016 males aged 18-24 years old were more likely to be employed on a part time basis than those aged 25 years old and older. In Quarter one 2016\textsuperscript{615}, over a quarter (28.2\%) of 18-24 year old males were employed part-time compared to 5.2\% of 25-49 year old males and 8.6\% of 50-64 year old males.


\textsuperscript{610}Between 2009 and 2012.

\textsuperscript{611}Between 2012 and 2016.

\textsuperscript{612}The Commission analysed data from 2012, where Raeside et al. (2014) ceased, to 2016.

\textsuperscript{613}In Q1 2012 the employment rate for those aged 25-49 years old was 81.1\%, this decreased to 79.5\% in Q1 2016; a difference of 1.6 percentage points. In Q1 2012 the employment rate for those aged 50-64 years old was 60.9\%, this increased to 64.0\% in Q1 2016; a difference of 3.1 percentage points.

\textsuperscript{614}The lowest gap between those aged 50-64 years old and those aged 25-49 years old was 14.5 percentage points in Q3 2015 whilst the largest was 16.0 percentage points in Q1 2012.

\textsuperscript{615}Quarter 1 in each of the following years was considered: 2012; 2013; 2014; 2015; and, 2016.
Between 2012 and 2016616, males aged 18-24 years old were between 2.7 to 6.1 times more likely to work part time than males aged 25-49 years old617 and, 1.8 to 5.0 times more likely to work part time than males aged 50-64 years old618.

**Difference**

Those aged 25 years and older are less likely to work in the private sector than those aged 18-24 years old.

Raeside *et al.* (2014) identified that private sector employment was more common for those aged 18-24 years old than for those aged 25-64 years old between 2006 and 2012619.

The Commission, upon its analysis of LFS data, also found that between 2012 and 2016; those aged 25 years and older were less likely to work in the private sector than those aged 18-24 years old. In Quarter one 2016620, the vast majority (95.7%) of 18-24 year olds worked in private sector employment compared to nearly three quarters (71.3%) of 25-49 year olds and nearly two thirds (64.6%) of 50-64 year olds. Between 2012 and 2016 private sector employment increased for 18-24 year olds621 and for 25-49 year olds622 and remained stable for 50-64 year olds623.

---

616 The part time employment rates for those aged 18-24 years old were 26.2% in Q1 2012; 30.1% in Q1 2013; 30.3% in Q1 2014; 35.7% in Q1 2015; and, 28.2% in Q1 2016. The part time employment rates for those aged 25-49 years old were 5.2 in Q1 2012; 7.5% in Q1 2013; 7.2% in Q1 2014; 5.9% in Q1 2015; and, 5.2% in Q1 2016. The part time employment rates for those aged 50-64 years old were 10.0% in Q1 2012; 10.0% in Q1 2013; 10.6% in Q1 2014; 7.1% in Q1 2015; and, 8.6% in Q1 2016.

617 Males aged 18-24 years old were 2.7 times more likely to be employed part time than males aged 25-49 years old in Q3 2014 and 6.1 times more likely in Q1 2015.

618 Males aged 50-64 years old were 1.8 times more likely to be employed part time than males aged 50-64 years old in Q3 2014 and 5.0 times more likely in Q1 2015.


620 Quarter 1 in each of the following years was considered: 2012; 2013; 2014; 2015; and, 2016.

621 The private sector employment rate for those aged 18-24 years old in Q1 2012 was 88.0% compared to 95.7% in Q1 2016; an increase of 7.7 percentage points.

622 The private sector employment rate for those aged 25-49 years old in Q1 2012 was 68.5% compared to 71.3% in Q1 2016; an increase of 2.8 percentage points.

623 The private sector employment rate for those aged 50-64 years old in Q1 2012 was 64.3% compared to 64.6% in Q1 2016; an increase of 0.3 percentage points.
Both Raeside et al. (2014)^{624} and the Commission noted that females are less likely to work in the private sector than males. The Commission extended its analysis of LFS data over the period 2012 to 2016 to take into account both the gender and age of those in private sector employment.

The results of this analysis show that in Quarter one 2016, employment in the private sector was less likely for females than males in all age groups^{625}. However, the gender gap in private sector employment was smaller for 18-24 year old females (at 5.2-percentage points)^{626} than for 25-49 year old females (at 20.6-percentage points)^{627} and 50-64 year old females (at 24.6-percentage points)^{628}. Therefore, females aged 25 years and older are least likely to work in the private sector than males aged 25 years and older and both males and females aged 18-24 years.

Between 2012 and 2016, the gender gap in private sector employment had narrowed by 8.5-percentage points for 18-24 year old females^{629} but had increased for 25-49 year old

---


^{625} The private sector employment rates were 98.1% in Q1 2016 for males and 92.9% for females aged 18-24 years. The private sector employment rates were 98.1% in Q1 2016 for males and 92.9% for females aged 18-24 years. The private sector employment rates were 75.6% in Q1 2016 for males and 51.0% for females aged 50-64 years.

^{626} The private sector employment rates were 98.1% in Q1 2016 for males and 92.9% for females aged 18-24 years.

^{627} The private sector employment rates were 81.7% in Q1 2016 for males and 59.6% for females aged 25-49 years.

^{628} The private sector employment rates were 75.6% in Q1 2016 for males and 51.0% for females aged 50-64 years.

^{629} The private sector employment rates for males aged 18-24 years were: 94.3% in Q1 2012; 96.4% in Q1 2013; 90.1% in Q1 2014; 86.1% in Q1 2015; and, 98.1% in Q1 2016. In comparison, the private sector employment rates for females aged 18-24 years were: 80.6% in Q1 2012; 86.9% in Q1 2013; 90.6% in Q1 2014; 80.1% in Q1 2015; and, 92.9% in Q1 2016. The gender gap in Q1 2012 was 13.7 percentage points compared to 5.2 percentage points in Q1 2016.
females and 50-64 year old females (by 4.8-percentage points and 2.5-percentage points respectively) 630 631.

In Raeside et al.’s (2014) analysis of LFS data, the industry sector that accounted for the greatest proportion of 18-24 year olds in both 2006 and 2012 was the 'Distribution, Hotels and Restaurants’ sector632, 633. Similarly, the Commission’s analysis of LFS data, between 2012 and 2016, confirmed that the greatest proportion of 18-24 year olds worked in this industry sector at each time point634.

The Commission also found that, between 2012 and 2016, 18-24 year olds were over-represented in the 'Distribution, Hotels and Restaurants’ sector, with proportionately more 18-24 year olds employed in this sector than their share of the Northern Ireland population635.

9.31

The private sector employment rates for males aged 25-49 years old were: 76.2% in Q1 2012; 81.7% in Q1 2013; 78.4% in Q1 2014; 80.2% in Q1 2015; and, 81.7% in Q1 2016. In comparison the rates for females aged 25-49 years old were: 60.4% in Q1 2012; 61.0% in Q1 2013; 61.7% in Q1 2014; 61.0% in Q1 2015; and, 59.6% in Q1 2016. The gender gap in Q1 2012 was 15.8 percentage points compared to 20.6 percentage points in Q1 2016.

9.32

The private sector employment rates for males aged 50-64 years old were: 74.4% in Q1 2012; 76.1% in Q1 2013; 75.4% in Q1 2014; 76.3% in Q1 2015; and, 75.6% in Q1 2016. In comparison the rates for females aged 50-64 years old were: 52.3% in Q1 2012; 53.2% in Q1 2013; 48.9% in Q1 2014; 53.1% in Q1 2015; and, 51.0% in Q1 2016. The gender gap in Q1 2012 was 22.1 percentage points compared to 24.6 percentage points in Q1 2016.

630 The private sector employment rates for males aged 25-49 years old were: 76.2% in Q1 2012; 81.7% in Q1 2013; 78.4% in Q1 2014; 80.2% in Q1 2015; and, 81.7% in Q1 2016. In comparison the rates for females aged 25-49 years old were: 60.4% in Q1 2012; 61.0% in Q1 2013; 61.7% in Q1 2014; 61.0% in Q1 2015; and, 59.6% in Q1 2016. The gender gap in Q1 2012 was 15.8 percentage points compared to 20.6 percentage points in Q1 2016.

631 The private sector employment rates for males aged 50-64 years old were: 74.4% in Q1 2012; 76.1% in Q1 2013; 75.4% in Q1 2014; 76.3% in Q1 2015; and, 75.6% in Q1 2016. In comparison the rates for females aged 50-64 years old were: 52.3% in Q1 2012; 53.2% in Q1 2013; 48.9% in Q1 2014; 53.1% in Q1 2015; and, 51.0% in Q1 2016. The gender gap in Q1 2012 was 22.1 percentage points compared to 24.6 percentage points in Q1 2016.


633 In Q1 2016 34.2% of 18-24 year olds were employed in the 'Distribution, Hotels and Restaurants’ sector compared to 37.6% in Q1 2012.

634 The Commission’s analysis was slightly different than Raeside et al.’s (2014) due to seasonal adjustments: 38.0% at Q1 2012; 43.1% at Q1 2013; 44.1% at Q1 2014; 39.0% at Q1 2015; and, 40.8% at Q1 2016.

635 15.8% of the population is 18-24 years according to Census 2011 and 15.0% of the population is 18-24 year old by 2015 population estimates. See: Census Table Usually Resident Population by single year of age and sex (statistical geographies) and NISRA (2016) 2015 Mid-year Population Estimates for Areas within Northern Ireland
The Commission analysis of LFS industrial sector data over the period 2012 to 2016 showed that those aged 50-64 years old also experienced industrial segregation.\textsuperscript{636}

Between 2012 and 2016, 50-64 year olds were under-represented in the ‘Distribution, Hotels and Restaurants’ sector,\textsuperscript{637} and the ‘Banking and Finance’ sector with proportionately less 50-64 year olds employed in these sectors than their share of the Northern Ireland population.\textsuperscript{639}

Raeside \textit{et al.}'s (2014)\textsuperscript{640} analysis of LFS data, found that greatest proportion of 18-24 year olds in 2012 were in ‘Sales and Customer Service’ and ‘Elementary Occupations’.\textsuperscript{641} Similarly, the Commission’s analysis of LFS data\textsuperscript{642} found that,

\begin{itemize}
  \item Employees aged 50-64 years old are under-represented in the ‘Distribution, Hotels and Restaurants’; and, ‘Banking and Finance’ industry sectors.
  \item Employees aged 18-24 years old are over-represented in ‘Sales and Customer Service’ or ‘Elementary Occupations’ compared to those aged 25 years or older.
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{636} Q1 in each year was analysed and compared.
\textsuperscript{637} Those aged 50-64 years old made up the following proportions of those employed in the ‘Distribution, Hotels and Restaurants’ sector: 19.6\% in Q1 2012; 22.7\% in Q1 2013; 18.4\% in Q1 2014; 19.1\% in Q1 2015; and, 17.1\% in Q1 2016.
\textsuperscript{638} Those aged 50-64 years old made up the following proportions of those employed in the ‘Banking and Finance’ sector: 20.7\% in Q1 2012; 19.2\% in Q1 2013; 19.4\% in Q1 2014; 24.9\% in Q1 2015; and, 24.8\% in Q1 2016.
\textsuperscript{639} 27.8\% of the population is 50-64 years old according to Census 2011 and 29.9\% of the population is 50-64 year old by 2015 population estimates. See: Census Table \textit{Usually Resident Population by single year of age and sex (statistical geographies)}, and NISRA (2016) \textit{2015 Mid-year Population Estimates for Areas within Northern Ireland}.
\textsuperscript{641} Raeside \textit{et al.} (2014) found that 22.8\% of those aged 18-24 years old worked in ‘Sales and Customer Service’ occupations and 20.2\% in ‘Elementary Occupations’.
\textsuperscript{642} The Commission’s analysis of Q1 2012 data was slightly different than Raeside \textit{et al.}’s (2014) due to seasonal adjustments.
between 2012 and 2016, ‘Sales and Customer Services’\(^\text{643}\) and ‘Elementary Occupations’\(^\text{644}\) also accounted for the highest proportion of 18-24 year olds at each time point.

The Commission also found that, between 2012 and 2016, 18-24 year olds were over-represented in ‘Sales and Customer Service’\(^\text{645}\) and ‘Elementary Occupations’\(^\text{646}\), with proportionately more 18-24 year olds employed in these occupations than their share of the Northern Ireland population\(^\text{647}\).

---

\(^{643}\) The proportion of those aged 18-24 years old employed in ‘Sales and Customer Service’ occupations were: 23.1% in Q1 2012; 21.8% in Q1 2013; 22.8% in Q1 2014; 20.7% in Q1 2015; and, 32.7% in Q1 2016.

\(^{644}\) The proportion of those aged 18-24 years old employed in ‘Elementary Occupations’ were: 20.1% in Q1 2012; 25.9% in Q1 2013; 25.5% in Q1 2014; 18.1% in Q1 2015; and, 20.2% in Q1 2016.

\(^{645}\) Those aged 18-24 years old made up the following proportions of those employed in the ‘Sales and Customer Service’ occupations: 28.8% in Q1 2012; 25.9% in Q1 2013; 33.8% in Q1 2014; 25.1% in Q1 2015; and, 35.0% in Q1 2016.

\(^{646}\) Those aged 18-24 years old made up the following proportions of those employed in ‘Elementary Occupations’: 17.6% in Q1 2012; 23.7% in Q1 2013; 23.7% in Q1 2014; 17.8% in Q1 2015; and, 21.4% in Q1 2016.

\(^{647}\) 15.8% of the population is 18-24 years according to Census 2011 and 15.0% of the population is 18-24 year old by 2015 population estimates. See: Census Table [Usually Resident Population by single year of age and sex (statistical geographies)](https://www.nisra.gov.uk/statistical-theme/usually-resident-population) and NISRA (2016) [2015 Mid-year Population Estimates for Areas within Northern Ireland](https://www.nisra.gov.uk/).
10 Sexual Orientation

10.1 Little background or contextual data is available on lesbian, gay and bisexual people in Northern Ireland. There are currently no or limited statistics (for example, the Census, government administrative datasets) that monitor the sexual orientation of the population.

10.2 In addition, where sexual orientation has been recorded there have been issues with comparability between surveys due to a lack of standardisation of questions and the complexity of the subject. Raeside et al. (2014) reported that ‘there is at present no reliable information on the size of the lesbian, gay and bisexual (LGB) population in the UK because of problems of question content, wording and categorisation for sexual orientation surveys’.

10.3 Different definitions and measurement of sexual orientation, in turn, can contribute to differential estimations of sexual orientation in the population. As yet, no population studies have established a comprehensive means to address the complexity of measuring sexual orientation.

10.4 Limited information on sexual orientation is available from surveys; however, it is unknown how representative these statistics are of the population as a whole. In 2014, the ONS Integrated Household Survey as part of its sexual identity project, indicated that in Northern Ireland, 1.6% of respondents identified as lesbian, gay or bisexual, while 0.3% identified their sexual orientation as “other”, 4.0% did not know or refused to answer while 1.2% did not respond to the question. In addition, in 2014, the NILTS found that, 1% of its respondents reported being lesbian or gay, 1% said they were bisexual with 5% refusing to answer the question.

---

Summary

10.5 There are inequalities related to attitudes toward lesbian, gay and bisexual people in employment. **Lesbian, gay and bisexual employees are subject to prejudicial attitudes in the workplace.** Lesbian, gay and bisexual people often face negative comments and bullying at work due to their sexuality, and may be reluctant to come out in the workplace due to fears of victimisation. Prejudicial attitudes may impact on the ability of lesbian, gay and bisexual people to participate in employment and sustain employment.

10.6 There are data gaps in relation to the experience of lesbian, gay and bisexual people in the labour market. These gaps mean that it is difficult to monitor inequalities in relation to participation in employment and sustaining employment for lesbian, gay and bisexual people in Northern Ireland.

Key Inequalities

**Key Inequality**

Lesbian, gay and bisexual employees are subject to prejudicial attitudes in the workplace.

10.7 There is evidence that lesbian, gay and bisexual (LGB) employees may be at risk of prejudicial attitudes and discrimination.

10.8 The Northern Ireland Life and Times Survey (NILTS) for the years 2012 and 2013 included a module on attitudes to LGB people in Northern Ireland. The survey asked respondents to state how comfortable they would be with a gay or lesbian: work colleague; boss in a new job; or, someone they manage in a new job. Attitudes toward gay and lesbian people were very positive in these hypothetical scenarios. In 2013, most respondents were either very or fairly comfortable with a lesbian or gay person as work colleague (91%); boss in a new...
job (79%); or, someone they manage in a new job (78%). However, around a tenth were either fairly or very uncomfortable with a lesbian or gay person as a work colleague (9%); boss in a new job (10%); or, someone they manage in a new job (9%)655.

10.9 Research on the experiences of LGB people in the workplace in Northern Ireland and Great Britain indicates that lesbian, gay, and bisexual people may be subject to prejudicial attitudes, bullying and harassment on the grounds of sexual orientation.

10.10 McDermott (2011) conducted an online survey among 752 lesbian, gay and bisexual people in employment. He reported that 31% of respondents in the community, voluntary and nongovernmental sector, and around two fifths of respondents working in the public (40%) and private sectors (42.5%) had ‘heard negative comments about LGB people from a colleague or colleagues in the workplace’ that made them feel uncomfortable656.

10.11 In addition, around a fifth (19.9%) of respondents from the private sector and 17.9% from the community, voluntary and nongovernmental sector respondents and 15.1% of public sector respondents had felt uncomfortable at work due to a negative comments directed at them due to their sexual orientation657.

10.12 McDermott’s (2011) study also found that around a quarter (26.2%) of respondents in the community, voluntary and nongovernmental sector, and a fifth of respondents in the public (21.0%) and private sector (21.6%) felt that light-hearted comments about their sexual orientation in the workplace also made them feel uncomfortable658.

655 The percentages for a gay or lesbian work colleague were 8% in 2012 and 9% in 2013, respectively. The percentages for a gay or lesbian gay or lesbian boss in a new job were 10% in 2012 and 10% in 2013, respectively. The percentages for a gay or lesbian person as someone they manage in a new job were 9% in 2012 and 9% in 2013, respectively.
A study conducted by YouGov for Stonewall in Great Britain (Guasp, 2013) asked respondents about their experiences of verbal bullying. It found that nearly a fifth of respondents had ‘experienced verbal bullying from colleagues, customers or service users because of their sexual orientation in the last five years’.

More specifically, 15% had experienced bullying from colleagues and 8% from customers, clients and service users in the previous five years. With regard to bullying from colleagues, the bullying experienced was most often from members of their own or a different work team. It was also found that around a third of those colleagues who bullied were either senior to the LGB employee (35%) or their manager (30%).

Research has also revealed that lesbian, gay and bisexual people are often reluctant to reveal their sexual identity in the workplace due to fears of victimisation. For example, McDermott (2011) found that around a quarter of respondents in the private (26.9%) and public sector (24.5%) indicated that they concealed their sexual orientation from both work colleagues and clients.

However, McDermott (2011) found that younger respondents of 16-29 years (18.0%) or 30-44 years (21.2%) were less likely to conceal their sexual orientation at work compared respondents aged 45-59 years (33.9%) and those aged 60-74 years old (30.8%).

A Great Britain based study conducted by YouGov on behalf of Stonewall (Guasp, 2013) also found age differences in whether or not LGB employees were ‘out to colleagues’, those aged 18 to 29 years old and those aged 50 years old or older were less...
likely to be ‘out to colleagues’ than those aged 30 to 50 years old\textsuperscript{665}.

10.18 In addition, the YouGov study (Guasp, 2013) found that bisexual employees were less likely than gay or lesbian employees to share their sexual orientation with work colleagues\textsuperscript{666, 667}.

10.19 Miles’ Great Britain based research (2008) focused on lesbian and bisexual women within the workplace. Whilst some of Miles’ (2008) interviewees felt that being open about their sexual orientation at work ‘\textit{gave them an unequivocal advantage in terms of networking, career development and raising their profile in the organisation}’\textsuperscript{668}, many did not feel able to disclose their sexual orientation within the workplace due to concerns about how their employment opportunities might be affected\textsuperscript{669}.

10.20 When asked about the impact of sexual orientation on career progression at work, most respondents to McDermott’s (2011) study\textsuperscript{670} did not feel that their sexual orientation would have an impact on their career progression. However, many respondents felt that it would. For example, less than a third (31.7\%) of respondents in the private sector, over a quarter (26.3\%) in the public sector and over a fifth (21.4\%) in the community, voluntary and nongovernmental sector perceived that their sexual orientation would have a negative impact on their career\textsuperscript{671}.

\textsuperscript{665} Guasp, A. (2013) \textit{Gay in Britain. Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual People's Experiences and Expectations of Discrimination}.

\textsuperscript{666} Guasp (2013) reported that 60\% of bisexual males and 37\% of bisexual females were ‘not out to any of their colleagues’ compared to 15\% of gay men and 6\% of lesbians.

\textsuperscript{667} Guasp, A. (2013) \textit{Gay in Britain. Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual People's Experiences and Expectations of Discrimination}.

\textsuperscript{668} Miles, N. (2008) \textit{The double-glazed glass ceiling. Lesbians in the workplace}.

\textsuperscript{669} Miles, N. (2008) \textit{The double-glazed glass ceiling. Lesbians in the workplace}.

\textsuperscript{670} Mc Dermott, M (2011) \textit{Through Our Eyes. Experiences of Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual People in the Workplace}.

\textsuperscript{671} Mc Dermott, M (2011) \textit{Through Our Eyes. Experiences of Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual People in the Workplace}.
Little information is available on the employment opportunities of lesbian, gay and bisexual (LGB) individuals in Northern Ireland due to a lack of monitoring of this equality group in official statistics\textsuperscript{672}.

Therefore, data on sexual orientation and the Northern Ireland labour market is not available from surveys such as the Labour Force Survey\textsuperscript{673}.


11 Marital Status

Summary

11.1 A number of differences in employment on the grounds of marital status where identified in this section. Further evidence is required to establish whether these differences are inequalities.

Differences

Those who are single are more likely to be economically inactive than those who are married, co-habiting or in a civil partnership.

11.2 Raeside et al. (2014) found that, between 2006 and 2012, those who were single had higher rates of economic inactivity than those who were married, co-habiting or in a civil partnership.674

11.3 Similarly, the Commission’s analysis of LFS data found that, between 2012 and 2016, those who were single and have never been married,675 had higher rates of economic inactivity than those who were married, co-habiting or in a civil partnership.676

---


675 In Q1 35.9% of those who were single and have never married were economically inactive compared to 34.4% in Q1 2013; 32.0% in Q1 2014; 33.7% in Q1 2015; and, 31.6% in Q1 2016.

676 In Q1 19.1% of those who were married, co-habiting or in a civil partnership were economically inactive compared to 20.0% in Q1 2013; 19.8% in Q1 2014; 18.3% in Q1 2015; and, 18.0% in Q1 2016.
11.4 Raeside et al.’s (2014) analysis of LFS data over the period 2006 to 2012 found that those who were previously married but are now separated, divorced or widowed had consistently higher rates of economic inactivity than those who were married, co-habiting or in a civil partnership\(^{677}\).

11.5 Similarly, the Commission through its analysis of LFS data, found that, between 2012 and 2016, those who were previously married but are now separated, divorced or widowed\(^{678}\) maintained consistently higher rates of economic inactivity than those who were married, co-habiting or in a civil partnership and those who were single and have never married\(^ {679}\).

**Difference**

Those who are separated, divorced or widowed are more likely to be economically inactive than those who are married, co-habiting or in a civil partnership and those who are single.

11.6 Raeside et al.’s (2014) analysis of the Labour Force Survey (LFS) data showed that, in 2006 and 2012, those who were married, co-habiting or in a civil partnership consistently had higher rates of employment (76.6% and 81.5% respectively) than those who were single and have never married (61.6% and 56.1% respectively)\(^ {680}\).

---


\(^{678}\) In Q1 37.2% of those who were previously married but are now separated, divorced or widowed were economically inactive compared to 34.0% in Q1 2013; 38.1% in Q1 2014; 41.6% in Q1 2015; and, 42.5% in Q1 2016.

\(^{679}\) From 2013. In Q4 2013 38.0% of those who were previously married but are now separated, divorced or widowed were economically inactive compared to 32.2% of those who were single and have never married; a 5.8 percentage point difference. This remained consistent until, and including, Q1 2016.

11.7 The Commission, through its analysis of LFS data, also found that, in 2016, those who were married, co-habiting or in a civil partnership had a higher rates of employment (80.1%) than those who were single and have never married (60.5%). In addition, between 2012 and 2016, there has been a slight narrowing of the gap between the two groups\textsuperscript{681, 682}.

**Difference**

Those who are separated, divorced or widowed are less likely to be in employment than those who are married, co-habiting or in a civil partnership.

11.8 Raeside et al.’s (2014) analysis of LFS data found lower rates of employment for those who were previously married but are now separated, divorced or widowed compared to those who were married, co-habiting or in a civil partnership\textsuperscript{683, 684}.

11.9 Similarly, the Commission, through its analysis of LFS data, found that in 2016, those who were previously married but are now separated, divorced or widowed had lower rates of employment (52.3%) compared to those who were married, co-habiting or in a civil partnership (80.1%).

11.10 Between 2012 and 2016 there has been an increase in the employment gap; with a decrease in the employment rate for those who were previously married but are now separated, divorced or widowed\textsuperscript{685} and an increase in the employment rate for those who were married, co-habiting or in a civil partnership.

\textsuperscript{681} The Commission found the following employment rates for those who were married, co-habiting or in a civil partnership: 78.5% in Q1 2012; 78.1% in Q1 2013; 77.6% in Q1 2014; 80.0% in Q1 2015; and, 80.1% in Q1 2016.

\textsuperscript{682} The Commission found the following employment rates for those who were single and have never married: 55.5% in Q1 2012; 55.6% in Q1 2013; 59.7% in Q1 2014; 57.8% in Q1 2015; and, 60.5% in Q1 2016.

\textsuperscript{683} Raeside reported rate of employment for those who were previously married but are now separated, divorced or widowed to be 61.7% in Q1 2006 and 63.2% in Q1 2012.


\textsuperscript{685} The Commission found the following employment rates for those who were previously married but are now separated, divorced or widowed: 58.6% in Q1 2012; 57.6% in Q1 2013; 56.0% in Q1 2014; 55.1% in Q1 2015; and, 52.3% in Q1 2016.
Raeside et al. (2014) found a small difference in the rates of employment of those aged 25-49 years old who were previously married but are separated, divorced or widowed and those aged 25-49 years old who are single and have never been married in 2012 compared to 2006.

The Commission, from its analysis of LFS data over the period 2012 to 2016, also found the difference in rates to be small during 2012 and 2013. However, in 2014 the largest gap between the two groups was evident at 14.7 percentage points, before decreases were again evident in 2015 and 2016; in 2016 the 10.7 percentage point difference was still worthy of note.

Raeside et al. (2014) found that, between 2006 and 2012, those who were single and had never married had the highest unemployment rates of any marital status group.

Too few people who were previously married but are now separated, divorced or widowed were found in the LFS from 2012 to 2016 to allow analysis by the Commission. However, the Commission found that, in 2016, those who were single and had never married had the highest unemployment rates of any marital status group.

---

686 Raeside found a percentage point difference of 4.6 percentage points in 2012.
688 In 2012 the percentage point difference calculated by the Commission was 4.2 percentage points, this decreased to 2.8 percentage points in 2013.
689 The percentage point difference was 7.5 percentage points in 2015.
691 The numbers of those who were previously married but are now divorced, separated or widowed were too low to meet the 8,000 threshold for reporting set by NISRA.
never married were more likely to be unemployed (7.9%) than those who were married, co-habiting or in a civil partnership (1.9%). Between 2012 and 2016, those who were single and have never married were 3.2 to 5.6 times more likely to be unemployed than those who were married, co-habiting or in a civil partnership\textsuperscript{692}.

Difference

Those who are separated, divorced or widowed are more likely to be in part-time employment than those who are married, co-habiting or in a civil partnership.

11.15 The Commission’s analysis of LFS data found that, between 2012 and 2016 the rate of part-time employment for those who were previously married but are now separated, divorced or widowed remained consistently higher compared to those who are married, co-habiting or in a civil partnership\textsuperscript{693}.

Difference

Those aged 25-49 years old who are separated, divorced or widowed are more likely to be in part-time employment than those aged 50-64 years old who are separated, divorced or widowed.

11.16 The Commission’s analysis of LFS data over the period 2012 to 2016 found that, from 2014 to 2016, those aged 25-49 years old who were previously married but are now separated, divorced or widowed had higher rates of part-time employment than those aged 50-64 years old who were previously married but are now separated, divorced or widowed\textsuperscript{694}.

\textsuperscript{692} In Q1 2012 8.6% of those who were single and have never married were unemployed compared to 10.0% in Q1 2013; 8.3% in Q1 2014; 8.5% in Q1 2015; and, 7.9% in Q1 2016. The rates for those who were married, co-habiting or in a civil partnership were much lower at 2.4% in Q1 2012; 1.8% in Q1 2013; 2.6% in Q1 2014; 1.7% in Q1 2015; and, 1.9% in Q1 2016.

\textsuperscript{693} The rates for those who were previously married but are now separated, divorced or widowed were: 29.1% in Q1 2012; 29.8% in Q1 2013; 35.8% in Q1 2014; 31.5% in Q1 2015; and, 30.7% in Q1 2016. This was compared to the following rates for those who are married, co-habiting or in a civil partnership: 23.0% in Q1 2012; 22.8% in Q1 2013; 21.4% in Q1 2014; 20.8% in Q1 2015; and, 20.5% in Q1 2016.

\textsuperscript{694} The part-time employment rates for those aged 25-49 years old who were previously married but are now separated, divorced or widowed were: 43.4% in Q1 2014; 35.4% in Q1 2015; and, 43.7% in
Those who are married, co-habiting or in a civil partnership and those who are separated, divorced or widowed are less likely to work in the private sector than those who are single.

11.17 Both Raeside et al. (2014) and the Commission found that, between 2006 and 2012 and 2012 and 2016, those who were single and have never married had higher rates of private sector employment, than those who were married, co-habiting or in a civil partnership and those who were previously married but are now separated, divorced or widowed.

11.18 Raeside et al. (2014) found that, between 2006 and 2012, rates of employment in the private sector for those who were single were over ten percentage points higher than for those who were married, co-habiting or in a civil partnership and those who were previously married but are now separated, divorced or widowed.

11.19 The Commission found that this trend was also persistent between 2012 and 2016. Between 2012 and 2016, the vast majority (over three quarters) of those who were single and have never married were in private sector employment, higher than private sector employment rates for those who were married, co-habiting or in a civil partnership and those who were separated, divorced or widowed.

---

Q1 2016. This was compared to the following rates for those aged 50-64 years old who were previously married but are now separated, divorced or widowed: 31.3% in Q1 2014; 27.8% in Q1 2015; and, 25.1% in Q1 2016.


696 Between 2006 and 2012, the average rate of private sector employment was 77.9% for those who were single and have never married.


698 Between 2006 and 2012, the average rate of private sector employment was 66.2% for those who married, co-habiting or in a civil partnership and 65.8% for those who were previously married but are now separated, divorced or widowed.


700 The rates of private sector employment were: 65.2% in Q1 2012; 67.7% in Q1 2013; 66.5% in Q1 2014; 67.3% in Q1 2015; and, 66.5% in Q1 2016 for those who were married, co-habiting or in a civil partnership. This was compared to rates of: 78.1% in Q1 2012; 80.9% in Q1 2013; 79.9% in Q1 2014; 78.3% in Q1 2015; and, 81.8% in Q1 2016 for those who were single and have never married.
were previously married but are now separated, divorced or widowed.  

### Difference

Those aged 25-49 years old who are separated, divorced or widowed are less likely to work in the private sector than those aged 50-64 years old who are separated, divorced or widowed.

11.20 The Commission analysed LFS data over the period 2012 to 2016 by marital status and age. It found that in 2016, those aged 25-49 years old who were previously married but are now separated, divorced or widowed had lower rates of private sector employment (65.5%) than those aged 50-64 years old (80.6%).

11.21 Between 2012 and 2016, the trend in private sector employment reversed for those separated, divorced or widowed in these two age groups. In 2012-2013, rates of private sector employment were higher for those aged 25-49 years old compared to those aged 50-64 years old. However, in 2014 the employment rates for the two age groups converged, and reversed in 2015, culminating in a higher private sector employment for 50-64 year olds who are separated, divorced or widowed in 2016.

### Difference

Those who are single are over-represented in some industries and under-represented in others.

11.22 Through its analysis of LFS data, the Commission found that those who were single and have never married were more likely to work in the ‘Distribution, Hotels and Restaurants’

---

701 The private sector employment rates for those who were previously married but are now separated, divorced or widowed were: 69.2% in Q1 2012; 67.2% in Q1 2013; 61.5% in Q1 2014; 64.5% in Q1 2015; and, 79.8% in Q1 2016.

702 In Q1 2016, 65.5% of those aged 25-49 years old who were previously married but are now separated, divorced or widowed were in private sector employment compared to 80.6% of those aged 50-64 years old in the same marital status category.
industry sector\textsuperscript{703} than those who were married, co-habiting or in a civil partnership\textsuperscript{704}. In addition, they were less likely to work in the ‘Public, Administration, Education and Health’ industry sector\textsuperscript{705} than those who were married, co-habiting or in a civil partnership\textsuperscript{706} and those who were previously married but are now separated, divorced or widowed\textsuperscript{707}.

11.23 The Commission found that, between 2012 and 2016, those who were single and have never married were overrepresented in the ‘Distribution, Hotels and Restaurants’\textsuperscript{708} industry sector compared to their proportionate share of the employed population\textsuperscript{709}.

\textbf{Difference}

Those who were single are over-represented in some occupations and under-represented in others.

11.24 Raeside et al.’s (2014) analysis LFS data from 2006-2012 found that, those who were single and have never married were over-represented in the lower level occupation groups. The Commission’s analysis also found that, between 2012 and 2016, those who were single and have never married were

\textsuperscript{703} In Q1 2012 28.4% of those who were single and have never married worked in the ‘Distribution, Hotels and Restaurants’ industry sector, this remained fairly stable at 27.2% in Q1 2013; 27.3% in Q1 2014; 25.2% in Q1 2015; and, 28.4% in Q1 2016.

\textsuperscript{704} In Q1 2012 14.5% of those who were married, co-habiting or in a civil partnership worked in the ‘Distribution, Hotels and Restaurants’ industry sector, this remained fairly stable at 16.6% in Q1 2013; 13.2% in Q1 2014; 13.5% in Q1 2015; and, 16.6% in Q1 2016.

\textsuperscript{705} In Q1 2012 11.7% of those who were single and have never married worked in the ‘Public, Administration, Education and Health’ industry sector, this was compared to: 13.8% in Q1 2013; 13.3% in Q1 2014; 11.7% in Q1 2015; and, 14.3% in Q1 2016.

\textsuperscript{706} In Q1 2012 9.9% of those who were married, co-habiting or in a civil partnership worked in the ‘Public, Administration, Education and Health’ industry sector, this was compared to: 11.2% in Q1 2013; 11.1% in Q1 2014; 10.2% in Q1 2015; and, 11.9% in Q1 2016.

\textsuperscript{707} In Q1 2012 39.7% of those who were previously married but are now separated, divorced or widowed worked in the ‘Public, Administration, Education and Health’ industry sector, this was compared to: 43.7% in Q1 2013; 44.9% in Q1 2014; 34.2% in Q1 2015; and, 36.1% in Q1 2016.

\textsuperscript{708} Those single and have never married made up the following proportions of the workforce in the ‘Distribution, Hotels and Restaurants’ sector: 45.8% in Q1 2012; 44.7% in Q1 2013; 53.5%; 47.9%; and, 48.6%.

\textsuperscript{709} 35.1% of those who are in employment are single and never married; 54.8% of those employed are married, cohabiting or in a civil partnership; 10.1% of those employed are separated, divorced or widowed. Census Table CT006NI: Marital or civil partnership status by economic activity. Produced by NISRA upon request.
more likely to work in four occupation sectors: ‘Professional’; ‘Skilled Trades’; ‘Sales and Customer Service’; and, ‘Elementary’ occupations.

The Commission found that, between 2012 and 2016, those who were single and have never married were over-represented in ‘Sales and Customer Service’ and ‘Elementary’ occupations and under-represented in ‘Managers and Senior Officials’, ‘Professional’; and, ‘Administrative and Secretarial’ occupations compared to their proportionate share of the employed population.

---

710 The following proportions of those who were single and have never married were employed in ‘Professional Occupations’ between 2012 and 2016: 12.4% in Q1 2012; 12.5% in Q1 2013; 14.0% in Q1 2014; 14.9% in Q1 2015; and, 13.1% in Q1 2016, respectively.
711 The following proportions of those who were single and have never married were employed in ‘Skilled Trades’ occupations between 2012 and 2016: 15.4% in Q1 2012; 13.1% in Q1 2013; 14.0% in Q1 2014; 15.1% in Q1 2015; and, 13.3% in Q1 2016, respectively.
712 The following proportions of those who were single and have never married were employed in ‘Sales and Customer Service’ occupations between 2012 and 2016: 13.6% in Q1 2012; 14.6% in Q1 2013; 12.9% in Q1 2014; 12.2% in Q1 2015; and, 19.5% in Q1 2016, respectively.
713 The following proportions of those who were single and have never married were employed in ‘Elementary’ occupations between 2012 and 2016: 17.0% in Q1 2012; 15.9% in Q1 2013; 16.3% in Q1 2014; 13.4% in Q1 2015; and, 15.4% in Q1 2016, respectively.
714 The ‘Sales and Customer Service’ occupations sector workforce was made up of the following proportions of those who were single and have never married: 53.1% in Q1 2012; 57.8% in Q1 2013; 62.8% in Q1 2014; 51.1% in Q1 2015; and, 60.8% in Q1 2016.
715 The ‘Elementary’ occupations sector workforce was made up of the following proportions of those who were single and have never married: 46.0% in Q1 2012; 48.7% in Q1 2013; 49.3% in Q1 2014; 45.6% in Q1 2015; and, 47.5% in Q1 2016.
716 The ‘Managers and Senior Officials’ occupations sector workforce was made up of the following proportions of those who were single and have never married: 19.2% in Q1 2012; 16.5% in Q1 2013; 21.1% in Q1 2014; 19.6% in Q1 2015; and, 22.1% in Q1 2016.
717 The ‘Professional’ occupations sector workforce was made up of the following proportions of those who were single and have never married: 20.8% in Q1 2012; 23.1% in Q1 2013; 26.0% in Q1 2014; 27.3% in Q1 2015; and, 26.7% in Q1 2016.
718 The ‘Administrative and Secretarial’ occupations sector workforce was made up of the following proportions of those who were single and have never married: 28.7% in Q1 2012; 28.5% in Q1 2013; 37.3% in Q1 2014; 30.8% in Q1 2015; and, 27.6% in Q1 2016.
719 35.1% of those who are in employment are single and never married; 54.8% of those employed are married, cohabiting or in a civil partnership; 10.1% of those employed are separated, divorced or widowed. Census Table CT0306NI: Marital or civil partnership status by economic activity. Produced by NISRA upon request.
12 Conclusions

12.1 This draft Statement has highlighted the nature and extent of inequalities in Northern Ireland across the nine Section 75 equality grounds. It is clear that there is a range of both emergent and persistent inequalities.

12.2 This draft Statement reflects identified inequalities in employment, and brings to the fore a number of key inequalities that impacts on participation in employment, sustainability of employment and progression in employment.

Participation in Employment

12.3 The draft Statement identified inequalities for people with disabilities, women, lone parents with dependents, and Irish Travellers and young people in relation to participation in employment. People with disabilities were less likely to be in employment than non-disabled people; women were less likely to be in employment than men; lone parents with dependents were less likely to be in employment than people with no dependents or couples with dependents; and Irish Travellers were less likely to be in employment than any other ethnic group. All these groups also had high rates of economic inactivity.

12.4 Young people aged 18-24 years old were also more likely to be unemployed than all other age groups which may have a lifelong impact on their participation on employment. Evidence has shown that young people who are not in employment, education or training (NEET) are more likely to have lifelong problems such as worklessness, poverty, limited employment opportunities, low wages and ill health.\textsuperscript{720}

12.5 For women, evidence suggested that caring responsibilities were associated with low rates of participation, and this was similar to but further compounded for lone parents with dependents who have sole responsibility for the care of their child. The availability of accessible and affordable childcare is potentially a major factor associated with whether women

\textsuperscript{720} Bell and Blanchflower, quoted in McQuaid R, Holywood E, Canduela J (2010) Employment Inequalities in an Economic Downturn. ECNI:Belfast
participate in employment. However, traditional gender stereotypes of women, attitudes of employers to flexible working and the economic situation of a household may also impact on whether a woman chooses to participate in employment.

12.6 For people with disabilities, gaps in educational attainment may partially account for the large employment gap between people with and without disabilities. However, even when attainment is accounted for, participation in employment is still lower for people with disabilities. People with disabilities face additional barriers to participation in employment, such as access to transport, the accessibility of the physical environment, and access to support in employment. In addition, there are attitudinal barriers including stigma and discrimination, to the participation of disabled people in employment, particularly for those with mental ill health.

12.7 For Irish Travellers, gaps in educational attainment may partially account for the large employment gap between them and other ethnic groups. However, for female Irish Travellers, a greater traditional emphasis on family and a lack of familiarity with and/or cultural resistance to the use of formal childcare are also major barriers to their participation in employment. Another major barrier is prejudice and discrimination both in society and in the workplace with discriminatory attitudes preventing them from participating in employment.

Sustainability of Employment

12.8 The Draft Statement identified inequalities for people with disabilities, women, lone parents with dependents, and migrant workers in relation to *sustaining employment*. People with disabilities were more likely to be in part-time employment than non-disabled people; women were more likely to be in part-time employment than men; and lone parents with dependents were more likely to be in part-time employment than people with no dependents or couples with dependents.

12.9 For women, and lone parents with dependents, evidence suggests that part-time working is one means of gaining the flexibility to balance caring responsibilities while retaining employment. However, research has shown that part-time
employment is often associated with low paid jobs and atypical contracts and can therefore impact on the ability to sustain quality employment with a decent wage.

12.10 In addition, migrant workers, women and lone parents with dependents experienced occupational and industrial segregation with individuals more likely to be in low-paid jobs, in low paid industries, in precarious employment, and/or on atypical contracts.

12.11 While many migrants use employment in lower level occupations as a step to gaining better employment in the future, language proficiency, a lack of recognition of qualifications and tied housing may impact on their ability to progress in employment. In addition, migrant workers are particularly vulnerable to exploitation in employment, including human trafficking, precarious employment with poor terms and conditions, which impacts on their ability to sustain good quality employment.

12.12 Prejudicial attitudes and discrimination can also impact on the sustainability of employment. Employer attitudes can represent a barrier to disabled people staying in employment. This is observed in the high proportion of inquiries to the Commission’s Discrimination Advice team in relation to disability discrimination in employment.

12.13 Attitudes can also act as a barrier to progression in employment. Evidence has identified that women are often perceived negatively by employers for asking for flexible working to balance caring responsibilities, with part-time working as a result perceived by many parents as being detrimental to career progression.

12.14 Societal attitudes and the attitudes of employers and work colleagues can also represent a barrier to migrant workers, Irish Travellers, minority ethnic groups, and Muslims sustaining and progressing in employment; with high levels of prejudicial attitudes identified against these groups in Northern Ireland.

12.15 In addition, lesbian, gay and bisexual people may face negative comments and bullying at work due to their sexuality, and may be reluctant to come out in the workplace due to fears of victimisation. For Trans people, ignorance of Trans issues
among work colleagues and employers is a key issue in sustaining employment.

**Gaps in Data**

12.16 The *draft Statement* also makes clear that there is a lack of robust employment data relating to a number of equality groups, including Trans people and lesbian, gay and bisexual people.

12.17 In addition, there is lack of data disaggregation in relation to: ethnicity; and, dependency status. For example, key employment datasets offer limited detail with regard to data on minority ethnic groups. Often, where information is collected the numbers in the survey are too low to report upon.

- As noted by Irwin *et al.* (2014), monitoring by ethnicity currently ‘*only takes account of language and country of origin. In other words, most aspects pertaining to ethnicity are ignored through official monitoring*’\(^{721}\).

- Additionally, Irwin *et al.* (2014) note that there is ‘*a lack of local-level data*’. For example, on the sector of employment, job level and training undertaken by those from minority ethnic backgrounds\(^{722}\). This is also found to be true for Irish Travellers where a lack of systematic data on employment has been noted\(^{723}\).

12.18 This lack of data significantly impacts not only the degree to which overall inequalities in employment are assessed and monitored, but also impacts on the ability to monitor and evaluate individual actions taken by Government Departments and others to address these inequalities.

12.19 The Commission recognises the on-going work of a wide range of stakeholders to tackle both inequalities and general issues in employment, and the potential offered by initiatives such as the Employment Strategy for People with Disabilities\(^{724}\). Complex

---


\(^{724}\) Department of Communities (2016) Employment Strategy for People with Disabilities. DoC: Belfast
relationships exist between employment and other domains that will demand long-term multi-faceted policy interventions and it is clear from the evidence supporting the draft Statement that significant challenges still remain.

12.20 We also recognise the key role we play in highlighting and addressing these challenges through effectively using our full range of powers and duties in terms of promotion, advice and enforcement, research and working with employers across all sectors to highlight and adopt good practice so as to improve outcomes for disadvantaged groups.

12.21 Once finalised, Government, public bodies and others should use this draft Statement to take appropriate action to address these inequalities; including those pursuant to their equality and good relations duties under Section 75.

12.22 Many of the inequalities highlighted in this statement are persistent and have worsened over time; therefore, these issues must be prioritised and addressed as a matter of urgency.
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13 Annex 1

13.1 Rates of employment, unemployment and inactivity are based upon Labour Force Statistics, which are collated and presented on a quarterly basis\textsuperscript{725, 726}.

Terms Used

13.2 The table below presents Internal Labour Organisation definitions (ILO) used in this Statement; these are applicable to those aged 16 years old and older.

Table 1. ILO Terms and Definitions.\textsuperscript{16, 727}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economically active</th>
<th>Employed or unemployed in survey reference week.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>In employment if worked at least one hour in reference week or those who were temporarily away from their job. Work includes being: an employee; self-employed; unpaid worker in family business; or, participants in government-supported training schemes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>Those without work but are actively seeking work in past four weeks and are available to start work in next two weeks; or those who are out of work but have found a job and are waiting to start within the next two weeks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically inactive</td>
<td>Those who are neither in employment nor unemployed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{725}Quarter 1, January to March; Quarter 2, April to June; Quarter 3, July to September; and, Quarter 4, October to December.


**Population Demographics – Those in Employment**

13.3 The demographics below add to, and update, the demographics presented in Raeside *et al.*'s (2014) research. The data was produced during the Commission’s analysis of LFS data over the period 2012 to 2015 and presents Quarter 1 information only.

13.4 Unless otherwise indicated the data presented is for those aged 16-64 years old (the working age population considered in this *draft Statement*).
### Table 2. Proportion of each equality group in employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>71.5%</td>
<td>69.8%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>73.4%</td>
<td>75.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>63.8%</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td></td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-49</td>
<td></td>
<td>81.1%</td>
<td>79.0%</td>
<td>79.2%</td>
<td>81.1%</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-64</td>
<td></td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
<td>62.4%</td>
<td>62.6%</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community/Religious Background</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td></td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
<td>68.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td></td>
<td>70.4%</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
<td>68.9%</td>
<td>68.6%</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>63.3%</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td>69.7%</td>
<td>65.1%</td>
<td>80.1%</td>
<td>78.7%</td>
<td>72.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK &amp; Ireland</td>
<td></td>
<td>67.0%</td>
<td>66.1%</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
<td>68.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern European</td>
<td></td>
<td>80.4%</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>67.8%</td>
<td>83.6%</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td>74.2%</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disability Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td></td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Disabled</td>
<td></td>
<td>74.7%</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single, never married</td>
<td></td>
<td>55.5%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married/Co-habiting</td>
<td></td>
<td>78.5%</td>
<td>78.1%</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>80.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated/Divorced</td>
<td></td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependency Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married or Co-habiting with dependent children</td>
<td></td>
<td>74.3%</td>
<td>71.5%</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>74.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lone parent with dependent children</td>
<td></td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No dependent children</td>
<td></td>
<td>67.1%</td>
<td>66.3%</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
<td>68.6%</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Equality group composition of those in employment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equality Group</th>
<th>Time point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q1 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-49</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-64</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community/Religious Background</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Religion</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK &amp; Ireland</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern European</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Disabled</td>
<td>93.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single, never married</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married/Co-habiting</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated/Divorced</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependency Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married or Co-habiting with dependent children</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lone parent with dependent children</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No dependent children</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>